The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1892.

The Week.

If the Free-Coinage Bill passes the House through the deliberate absence, and consequently the virtual support, of Republican members who oppose it and whose constituencies oppose it, the delinquents will make a great mistake, both from the party and the personal point of view. Mr. A. P. Hyde, the leading Hartford Democrat, put the case rightly when he declared that "free silver would be the ruin of any party or individual that supported it." The *Nation* has repeatedly expressed its opinion that the passage of a free-coinage bill by the Democratic House would be disastrous to the party. But it may prove equally disastrous for the Republican Representative who connives at its passage. It is a public duty for every member of the House who believes that free coinage would injure the country to do everything in his power to prevent the passage of such a bill. He may think that its passage would hurt the Democratic party, but, if it would also harm the country, he is likely to find his constituents rebuking him if he winks at harm to the country in the hope of thereby hurting the opposition party. The man who refuses to do his duty as a patriot in the hope of personal profit is pretty sure in the end to suffer the just penalty of the traitor.

The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, which ought to be good authority as to such a matter, ridicules the position of "the timid Republicans of the East" who are talking about the necessity, or imagined necessity, of making some "concessions to the silver element of the West." It declares that the extent and potency of the silver sentiment of the West are ludicrously overestimated by some of the Eastern papers, and that they are quite as much astray as to the feeling even in the silver-producing States regarding the urgency of silver legislation at this time. The *Globe-Democrat* says that "the Republicans of the West, as a whole, are opposed to free coinage"; that "if the scheme were submitted to the popular vote of the Republicans residing west of the Alleghenies, or even west of the Mississippi, it would be overwhelmingly defeated"; that "outside of Colorado, Montana, and Nevada this doctrine finds no favor in the party, and even in those States the leading papers are advising their Representatives in Congress to display no undue haste in pressing this matter." The St. Louis newspaper goes still further. Not only does it declare that "the Western Republicans are not asking for any 'concessions' from the Eastern end of the party on the silver question," but it adds:

> "Strong and decided ground against the opening of the mints to silver must be taken by the National Convention. There must be no truckling or cringing to the miners and speculators. The clumsy, tricky, and dishonest utterances of the platform of 1888 on silver cannot be repeated safely this year. Western Republicans will stand no such shuffling, hypocrisy, and falsification in 1892."

This is the right sort of talk, and it is refreshing to hear it from the heart of the Mississippi valley. "Clumsy, tricky, and dishonest" are the proper adjectives to characterize the silver plank of the Republican platform of 1888. It was this deliverance of the Republican party which started the present agitation for free coinage. It was a deliverance which, it was claimed, was demanded by the Republicans of the West, and it is reassuring to be told by a leading Republican journal of that section now that "Western Republicans will stand no such shuffling, hypocrisy, and falsification in 1892."

The President on Wednesday week issued his first proclamation imposing duties at his own discretion. It applies to sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides imported from Colombia, Hayti, and Venezuela, and suspends the free admission of such imports from those countries, which must hereafter pay certain specified rates of duty. The recent decision of the Supreme Court established the constitutional power of the President thus to put on and take off duties, but it did not show that it was in the public interest for him to possess the prerogative. It is contrary to the whole theory of our system of Government that the Executive should have the right thus to exercise the taxing power at his personal discretion. For this is what it is—a matter of Benjamin Harrison's opinion. The essential part of the proclamation reads as follows:

> "And whereas, *It has been established to my satisfaction* and I find the fact to be, that the Government of Venezuela does impose duties or other exactions upon the agricultural and other products of the United States, which, in view of the free introduction of such sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, in accordance with the provisions of said act, *I deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable.*"

This is the language and the attitude of a sovereign—not of an official executing a law of the Legislature. The "effete despotisms of Europe" are accustomed to this sort of thing, but the theory and the practice of representative government in America have hitherto been that the taxing power belonged exclusively to the legislative branch of the Government. Under the reciprocity section of the McKinley Bill, Congress parted entirely with this prerogative concerning certain articles, and turned over to the President the imposition or removal of taxes upon them as he might deem best, and for as long or as short a time as he might deem best. The effect may not be disastrous in this case, but the principle is wrong, and the practice might lead to grave scandals if it were to be adopted as a permanent rule. Even before the issue of the proclamation, the price of Venezuela coffee to consumers in this country advanced four cents a pound on the strength of rumors that Mr. Harrison "deemed" it his duty to impose a tax upon it.

It would be strange if there were not felt in Venezuela a peculiar resentment at the action of President Harrison in levying a discriminating duty on the coffee and hides imported from that country. In the first place, the condition of our trade with Venezuela has been more satisfactory than in the case of perhaps any South American country—that is to say, it has been steadily expanding, has not been one-sided, and has built up a prosperous line of American steamers. Moreover, no Spanish-American country has been of late years so eager to be on good terms with the United States as Venezuela. She has shown hearty acceptance of the Monroe doctrine, and was quick to second the "America-for-Americans" talk at the Pan-American Congress. That she had selfish reasons for such a course may be admitted. She no doubt looked for help from the United States in her controversy with Great Britain as to the true boundary of British Guiana. In fact, she has repeatedly sought the good offices of this country in that dispute, and has obtained them. Secretaries Evarts, Frelinghuysen, and Bayard each made representations to the Court of St. James's looking towards a peaceful settlement of the quarrel. Mr. Blaine did not move in the matter during his first incumbency of the Secretaryship, though he seems to have done so latterly. But now all the good feeling brought about by these friendly relations is seriously imperilled by the retaliatory duties levied on Venezuelan products by the President's proclamation.

When the first telegraphic summary of the decision in the worsted-goods case, known as the United States, Appellants, vs. Ballin, Joseph & Co., by the Supreme Court, came from Washington, the *Tribune* concluded promptly that the Court had approved of Speaker Reed's course in the House in the Fifty-first Congress. It said that it had decided that "he was not a Czar"; that "he was attending to business"; that "the Court had decided, without a dissenting voice," that the members whom he counted in order to form a quorum "were there"; that it declared that "the Constitution had provided a cure for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wilful absence, and that wilful silence cannot then be made to render the House as incompetent as it had been before the cure was worked"; and much more of the same sort of thing. Commenting at the time (March 3) on these youthful inventions, we said:

"The Court holds that the rule adopted by the Fifty-first Congress for 'counting a quorum' was within the competency of Congress. . . . The propriety of such a rule is not passed upon by the Court, and obviously could not be."

These are elementary facts of American jurisprudence which every man who undertakes to discuss the powers of the Speaker ought to know. A man who undertakes to discuss these powers without knowing them ought to be a "disgrace to journalism," and some day he will be. The Supreme Court has not and cannot have any opinion about the "advantages or disadvantages, the wisdom or folly," of Reed's methods. It does not know and cannot know whether he was "a Czar" or "a tyrant" or not.

The full text of the decision has now come to hand. On the question raised in the pleadings, "Was the act of May 9, 1890, legally passed?" the Court says that there is nothing on the face of the bill, or in the journal of the House, "to suggest any invalidity," and that the journals of the House are to the Court conclusive proof as to the proceedings of the House; that the question whether a quorum was present when the bill was passed is, for the Court, settled by the journal. The presence of a quorum was ascertained under Speaker Reed's Rule XV., and as to the validity of this rule the Court says:

"*Neither do the advantages or disadvantages, the wisdom or folly, of such a rule present any matters for judicial consideration.* With the courts the question is only one of power. The Constitution empowers each house to determine its rules of proceedings. It may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained. But within these limitations all matters of method are open to the determination of the House, and it is no impeachment of the rule to say that some other way would be better, more accurate, or even more just. *It is no objection to the validity of a rule that a different one has been prescribed and in force for a length of time.* The power to make rules is not one which, once exercised, is exhausted. It is a continuous power, always subject to be exercised by the House, and within the limitations suggested, absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal."

It is not always easy to determine whether the State Department is "run" by the newspapers or whether the newspapers are "run" by the State Department. There was much perplexity on this subject when the Chilian difficulty was pending, and it was enhanced in that case by the course of the Navy Department, which seemed to be on the point of usurping the editorial functions of the State Department. Latterly, however, the State Department seems to have recovered its lost ground. In the Washington *Star* of March 15, for example, we read this:

"A State Department official said to a *Star* reporter this afternoon that in his opinion Salisbury was purposely delaying his answer until the sealing fleet had a chance to clear for Bering Sea. When they have gone so far that any attempt to stop illegal poaching for this season would be a failure, he will agree to a renewal of the modus pending arbitration. It would be too late then, and any agreement on the part of Great Britain would be a mere piece of political clap-trap, but according to the *Star's* informant the dilatory tactics of Salisbury during the past fortnight would justify no other conclusion in the matter."

In France, or Germany, or any country which has powerful armed neighbors, and where the issues of peace and war hang on a thread, such things could not be published with impunity. Any official who could be identified as the author of such dangerous impertinence would be dismissed from office and lodged in a fortress for a term of years, and the editor of the paper would be heavily fined. In this country we allow everybody to print everything, trusting to the good sense of the public to reject whatever is anonymous and sensational as probably false. Nevertheless, there is a residuum of belief that the anonymous and sensational thing may be true, and that although the "official of the State Department" would no more make such a statement over his signature (which is the only way he ought ever to make one) than he would walk in the street without any clothes, yet that this is what the whole State Department thinks. It is high time that some discipline were exercised to maintain common decency in the Department. If a newspaper which pretends to report the views of officials of the Department refuses to disclose their names, a rule should be posted forbidding any person connected with that paper from having access to the Department. This would be notice to the public that all interviews purporting to give the views entertained in the Department are fabrications. We cannot see any other way to preserve for the Department the respect that ought to be entertained for it by the people.

Although Harrison has secured the Indiana delegation to the National Convention, his opponents in the Republican party do not stop their efforts to prevent his renomination. Their opposition is based upon the assertion that he cannot carry his own State again. The chief newspaper organ of these Republicans is the Fort Wayne *Gazette*, one of the most prominent party organs in the State. Mr. N. R. Leonard, editor of the *Gazette*, has recently written an "open letter" in which he says that Harrison's renomination would, in his judgment, be a political mistake, and that he feels that a large number of the party in Indiana concur with him in these views. Mr. Leonard's reasons are thus frankly stated:

"Mr. Harrison is not a strong candidate so far as Indiana is concerned. It is more than doubtful whether he could carry its electoral vote this fall, were he renominated. In 1888, with the utmost assistance that could be given him by such men as Dudley and Huston, he only carried the State by the meagre plurality of 2,348.

There is a distinct recognition here of the fact that Harrison owed his narrow majority in 1888 to the "blocks-of-five" methods pursued under the direction of Dudley. The passage of the ballot-reform law has of course put an end to these methods, even if Dudley had the disposition to assist Harrison again. If Harrison could carry the State by only 2,348 plurality in 1888, when Dudley conducted a boodle campaign in his behalf, it certainly seems reasonable to expect his defeat in a fair election this year—reasonable, that is to say, if the issue between the two parties be the same in 1892 as it was in 1888. If the issue is shifted so that Harrison stands as the representative of sound money and honest finance, there will be no need of bribery to help him to carry the State. An honest election under the secret-ballot law will give him the State by a majority many times larger than "blocks of five" could secure four years ago.

The action of the Iowa Republican State Convention in endorsing Mr. Harrison, and choosing delegates to Minneapolis nearly all of whom favor his renomination, shows the hopelessness of the attempt to defeat the President's renomination. Iowa is Clarkson's State, and his old paper, the *Iowa State Register*, came out strongly in favor of electing Blaine (meaning thereby anti-Harrison) delegates; but the scheme was ridiculed by all the other party journals of any standing, and Clarkson himself was rebuked by receiving the smallest vote given any of the four delegates-at-large. Everybody but the dissatisfied politicians has seen for months that the President was sure to be renominated; even they must perceive it after the utter failure of Clarkson's anti-Harrison movement in the State which he used to boss.

Clarkson is a man of the Hill type, and he followed Hill's example in regard to the Republican State Convention in Iowa for the choice of delegates to the National Convention. The custom has always been to call such conventions late in the spring, but Clarkson, who controlled the State Committee, decided to convene it this year only three weeks after Hill's snap Convention in New York. But the movement against bossism which Hill's methods provoked caused a reaction against Clarkson also, and when the Convention met he found that he had no control whatever over it, and that he could not carry out his plan of electing an anti-Harrison delegation. Moreover, the revolt against Clarkson's plot is leading to such an exposure of the man by his fellow-Republi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cans as he has never had before. The *Floyd County Advocate*, for example, says of him: "This man Clarkson as Postmaster-General, and as an unblushing representative of the spoils system, did more to demoralize, degenerate, and subtract from the Republican party of the nation its manhood and the vigor of its strength than all other agencies united." There is no State where the demoralization wrought by Clarkson's methods is so evident as in Iowa, which used to go Republican by from 50,000 to 75,000 majority before he began to boss it, and has now twice elected a Democrat as Governor.

Judge Cooley contributes to the *Atlantic Monthly* for April a strong argument in favor of the taxation of lotteries by act of Congress. He examines the counter arguments that such taxation would be an encroachment upon the domain of the States, and that it would give an implied sanction of the Government to vice by sharing in the profits of gambling. These sophistical apologies for lottery swindling are thoroughly demolished. The taxation of State bank notes by Congress is held by Judge Cooley to have been a wise, constitutional measure, going on all fours with the proposed taxation of lotteries, except that more conclusive reasons can be found for attacking lotteries in this manner than for attacking State bank notes. Judge Cooley notices the recent access of loyalty on the part of the Louisiana Lottery people, who have promised to retire from business since the Supreme Court decided the postal case against them. He thinks that we shall be in a much safer position if we rely on a taxing law than on the promises of reformed gamblers. At all events, he says:

> "It will be very well to fortify any present law-abiding determination on the part of the managers by a law they cannot evade. Then they can pension the military chieftains who have so long been in their pay to guard them against being tempted into the low tricks and cheats of common gamblers and confidence operators, and retire upon their millions. A law that effectually takes their business by the throat they will bow to with great respect; neither promises nor the 'honor' of gamblers will restrain them from breaking or evading any other, when they believe money may be made thereby. The seared conscience is not troubled with scruples about law-breaking."

Senator Saxton's joint resolution for a constitutional amendment transferring the power to decide contested-election cases from the Legislature to the courts, which was adopted by the last Legislature, passed the Senate last week almost without opposition. If it shall now be passed by the Assembly, as there is every reason to expect, the question will be ready for submission to the people for adoption. There can be no doubt that it will meet with popular approval, for since the experience which this State went through after the last election nobody except professional seat-stealers can wish to have the present system continued. That experience would not have been possible had the power to decide all contests for legislative seats been lodged in the courts. The County Canvassing Boards and the Board of State Canvassers would not have ventured to tamper with the returns had their proceedings been subject to final review by the courts rather than by a partisan legislative majority, a majority which in the present instance was itself a fraudulent one, obtained by conspiracy and theft.

We recently remarked upon the amendment to the Copyright Law, now pending in Congress, which requires an author to deposit a copy of his book for every State, to be given to the libraries of State "institutions." The Faculty of the University of Virginia have forwarded to the Virginia Senators and Representatives a protest against the amendment. They say that they "regard this bill on the one hand as excessively unwise, in that it would encumber our State University libraries with a huge mass of useless literature; and on the other hand as grossly unjust, in that it would afflict authors and publishers with a tax always oppressive in character and frequently burdensome in amount." The Virginia professors are evidently not to be bribed to wink at literary thieving by a promise of a share of the plunder.

We invite attention to the speech of Gen. Stevens of Massachusetts on the Wool Tariff Bill. Mr. Stevens speaks with the highest authority, being himself the largest individual woollen manufacturer in the country. He has the support of other large and well-known manufacturers, including Robert Bleakie, Jesse Metcalf, William B. Weeden, Rowland Hazard, and Arthur Lyman, some of whose letters he read endorsing the bill now before the House. After such a presentation nobody can affirm that the bill is inimical to the woollen manufacturers. It may be said that its reflex influence will be bad by inciting the wool-growers to attack the manufacturers, but is it not likely that men having such large interests in the subject as Gen. Stevens have taken this factor into their reckoning also? If they can face the jack-o'-lantern of the Ohio shepherds, other people need not borrow trouble about it.

A municipal election was held in Biddeford, Me., the other day, at which 2,153 votes were cast, the result being a Democratic majority of 385. Outsiders have no concern in the question whether the Government of Biddeford is administered by Republicans or Democrats, but there was one feature of this election which is of great interest to all who are studying the development of our institutions. The *Journal*, one of the local papers, declares that votes were bought by the wholesale. "There are in our city," it says, "between 600 and 700 persons [the whole vote just cast was 2,153] who possess no political principles whatever, who also possess the right to vote. They are in the market for the highest bidder. So accustomed are they to make merchandise of a sacred constitutional right that the mass of them do not offer to vote at any election unless for a cash equivalent in hand. There is no secret about this. The boodle men who traffic in votes do not deny these allegations; they not only admit their truth, but boast of their ability to deliver their goods." For years past similar charges as to the prevalence of vote-buying in Maine have been current, so that these allegations as to Biddeford do not come as an entire surprise. They show the crying necessity which existed for the passage of a secret-ballot law. Such a law goes into effect at the State election next September.

The 'State Register and Manual for 1892,' just issued by the Connecticut Secretary of State, gives us for the first time, though in clumsy shape and without any summary, the results of the present license law in that commonwealth. There are 168 towns in the State, of which we find that 82 have "license" of liquor-selling, 81 have "no license," from four towns there are "no returns," and in one town the last vote on the question was a tie. By the locality test, "license" has now apparently a slight majority of the towns, as compared, if we are not mistaken, with a ratio of about three towns to two against license during the first few years following the adoption of the present system, some seventeen years ago. But by the test of population the dominance of the license idea is much more visible in the State. All of the twelve towns containing cities have license, and of the twenty-two borough towns all but five. The twelve urban towns and the town of Stamford alone contain about half the population of the State, so that it is within bounds to say that license is accepted by towns having not less than three-fourths of the citizens of Connecticut, and probably a much larger proportion than that. Of the eighty-two towns which voted on the question last October, "license" won in fifty-eight, "no license" in only twenty-three, and in one town there was a tie. In the towns which can be strictly classed as factory towns only two, Manchester and Windham, have "no license," and in both this is due to special or transitory causes. The figures are of direct interest as indicating how license gradually outstrips prohibition in an old New England State, where both systems have worked side by side during a considerable time. Perhaps the foremost reason why "no license" diminishes under those conditions is that a town normally favoring prohibition, but adjoining a license town, finds that it suffers most of the ills of the liquor traffic without taking in any fees, and naturally prefers to license and tax an evil from which it must suffer anyhow.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SENATOR HILL IN THE SOUTH.

THE chief burden and constant refrain of Senator Hill's speech at Jackson, Mississippi, was Unity. We are accustomed to speeches in favor of the Union, and when any public man talks of the Union we know what he means. But when a public man lays great stress upon Unity, we know that he means something different from Union, although it may be consistent with that. What Mr. Hill meant to urge and advise by that term was "Unite on Me as a candidate for the Presidency." Probably this advice was prompted by late news from the Empire State showing that the Democrats had lost, since their midwinter Convention and since they "presented" Mr. Hill as a unique gift and favorable specimen to the party at large, all that they had gained during the last two years, and something more. No wonder that Unity is the burden of song of this troubadour. Unity is wanted more in New York than in Mississippi. Unity on Hill is impossible in the former, however it may be in the latter, and this fact will become increasingly manifest and prominent as the weeks roll on towards the Chicago Convention. Unity on Hill is impossible, because the people who will not unite on him are those who care nothing for offices, spoils, rewards, places, but only for good government. They cannot be reached by appeals or threats, because the armory of politics contains nothing that they want or fear.

Turning to Mr. Hill's speech to find ideas applicable to the immediate concerns of government, and especially to matters pending in Congress, we find that he is very much opposed to the present silver law. Probably Mr. Hill's hearers wanted to know what he was in favor of rather than what he was opposed to. If such was their expectation, they were disappointed. The New York platform, adopted by the same convention that presented Mr. Hill as an attractive specimen and shining example to the party at large, denounced "any silver dollar that was not of the intrinsic value of any other dollar of the United States." There was no doubt about the meaning of those words. If Mr. Hill had any respect for his own party in his own State, or if he had any self-respect, he would say something about this all-important deliverance when he makes political speeches to Democrats elsewhere. If he speaks on the silver question at all, he is bound to tell where he stands; but he does not. He merely tells where the Republicans stand, and he does not tell that correctly. But this is of less importance than Mr. Hill's failure to say what he is in favor of. He implies that he is opposed to the Legal-Tender Act, or to the legal-tender decision of the Supreme Court, or at all events to the method by which it was obtained. But he does not say anything on this point out and out. If he had said, "I, David B. Hill, am opposed to any law which makes paper of any kind legal tender," we could have understood what he meant. But that is not his way. He is as far from saying that as he is from saying that he is either for or against the free coinage of silver.

The Southern people are famous for their hospitality to visitors. When President Harrison, a year ago, fresh from his efforts to secure the enactment of the Force Bill, made his trip through the South, he was received everywhere not only with civility, but with hearty courtesy. After such an object-lesson it was certain that any Democratic politician from the North who should make a similar trip would be greeted by large crowds and loud cheers, such as Mr. Hill encountered last week. The important question is, what the courteous hosts really think of the "visiting statesman" whom they have entertained, and this is already as clear in the case of Hill as it was in that of Harrison. The New York Senator delivered his speech in the Mississippi Capitol on Tuesday. On Thursday a canvass was made of the Presidential preferences of such members of the Legislature as could be reached, and only eight out of seventy declared themselves for Hill, while thirty-one were for Cleveland, with scattering votes for Gorman, Boies, etc., and a considerable contingent for "the man who can win." A despatch from Jackson says that "the complaint is general among the Alliance men that Hill did not define himself upon any of the economic questions which they regard as of vital importance. One member expressed his opinion by saying that he (Hill) went back to where the world was nothing better than a vapor, took a general crack at creation, and failed to hit anything he shot at."

The failure of Hill's electioneering trip is evident when a canvass is made of the people as distinguished from the politicians. Columbus is one of the chief towns of Mississippi, and a despatch from that place says:

> "One hundred and fifty of the business men of this city were interrogated yesterday as to their choice for President. The result was: Cleveland, 99; Hill, 38; Boies, 6; Palmer, 3; Campbell, 2; Gorman, 1. Hill's speech at Jackson has been a disappointment to many people here, and has not gained him any new friends."

There is, perhaps, no part of the country where the people have more contempt for a coward than in the South, and a public man could not possibly do anything so well calculated to forfeit their respect as to address to them long speeches in which he is afraid to define his position on the burning issues of the day.

THE SECRET OF WARRIORISM.

OUR suspicion that a large proportion of the warlike literature which appears in our contemporaries when we have any dispute with a foreign Power is the composition of patriots under eighteen, receives ample confirmation from a despatch in the *Herald*, last Thursday. Daniel Webster's observation in 1842 is certainly also true of to-day:

> "The great body of the intelligent people of the United States desire, I have no doubt, a firm and settled peace. But there are here, as in some European States, agitators, uneasy and restless spirits, who desire change, disturbance, and a new state of things. But a little more powerful class among us is made up of men of some consideration also, who, although they hardly desire war, yet as little desire a permanent and settled peace. They rejoice in instances of collision, in all incidents which ruffle the waters, and in whatever makes probable war a subject of speculation and conversation. I quite regret to say that our public councils are not always free from feelings of this kind, and these feelings easily spread and kindle under the fanning of patriotic professions, and an apparent readiness to offer conflicts to the greatest Powers in the world."

Ample corroboration for this is to be found in the fact that we never have the smallest difference with a foreign Power, when our newspapers and some of our public men do not *at once* begin to talk of an appeal to arms, to count our ships and guns, to accuse the other side of "arrogance and insult," and "mendacity," and "hypocrisy," and "deceit," and to assure the President of the support of Congress in case he should immediately resort to hostilities. This naturally excites the astonishment of diplomatists in other civilized countries, and puts to shame those friends of democracy who have been promising the world an era of sweet reasonableness under democratic government. For the model of diplomatic discussion in those countries is that of two gentlemen seated at a table trying to clear up a misunderstanding or make a contract on a matter of business. Our model, on the other hand, often seems to be that of two hostile "toughs" who have met by chance in a bar-room, and are bent on clearing off old scores, each watching closely lest the other should "get the drop" on him. No better illustration of this could be desired than President Harrison's first message to Congress about the Chilian matter. It was full from first to last of the grossest insults to the Chilian Government, which in private life no civilized man would think of uttering without expecting to be knocked down by the person on whom they were heaped.

The cardinal rule of all civilized diplomatic discussion is, that war shall be treated from the first as a probability so remote as to be, for practical purposes, an impossibility; just as in a discussion between two gentlemen each absolutely ignores the possibility of his having to punch the other's head. If at the outset either one of them were to take off his coat and his necktie, and ask the other to feel his biceps, and interrupt the conversation with stories of his pugilistic prowess, he would be justly considered a ruffian.

There is no doubt that the newspapers are to blame for a great deal of this. But as our readers may remember, we have all along maintained that a large part of the wild talk on these matters in which the newspapers indulge must be due to the extreme youth of the writers to whom foreign topics are assigned in some offices, and particularly in that of our esteemed contemporary, the *Tribune*. We have all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

along held that the impossibility of extracting from these journals any discussion of the law or the facts of an international controversy, was to be explained by the general and natural ignorance of boys on such subjects, combined with the ebullient, unreasoning patriotism which all youths feel between the ages of twelve and twenty. In every country in the world, it is the minors who are readiest to rally round the flag and hurl defiance against a world in arms. The "Marseillaise," "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles," "Rule Britannia," and "Hail Columbia" are in their respective countries sung by the boys with a fervor of which their elders know nothing. But in no country but our own are these youths allowed to stir up bellicose passions in the public press, and propose to fight first and negotiate afterwards.

The illuminating despatch in the *Herald*, of which we have spoken, came from Lyons, N. Y., and related to "young Walter Scott, son of Walter Scott, Chief Engineer of the Columbus Construction Company of Chicago, and grandson of J. T. Williams, editor-in-chief of the Dunkirk *Evening Observer*." He comes, it will be seen, of a journalistic family, and lives with his grandfather. His age is sixteen, and "out of school hours he assists in the mailing department" of his grandfather's newspaper. But he by no means confines his attention to these humble duties. He it was who sent that now famous letter to the London *Times*, threatening Great Britain with political effacement at the hands of an army of 2,000,000 Americans, transported in an enormous fleet of steel cruisers. Says the *Herald's* despatch:

"All articles that appeared in the *Herald* in regard to Chili were read and reread with increasing interest and avidity, and he would occasionally send for copies of the London *Times* so that nothing should escape his notice that had a bearing upon the view foreigners also took of the internal difficulties of that country, and upon its relations with the United States. In addition to his varied reading on the subject he has written hundreds of pages on the progress of Chilian matters and the causes of the misunderstanding between that Government and ours.

"He is entirely loyal to the Stars and Stripes, and the tone and criticisms of the English papers were too much for him to tamely listen to. He therefore determined, without consulting with any one, to give the *Times*, and through it the people of England, a piece of his mind. He signed a fictitious name, as he was afraid his letter might be rejected in case he told just who he was. He was much in earnest about what he wrote, but could not resist the temptation to indulge in more or less imagination when speaking of the boundless resources of the United States, its ability to raise powerful armies, capture Canada and invade England, blotting it from the map."

Now what became of these "hundreds of pages on the progress of Chilian matters and the causes of the misunderstanding between that Government and ours"? Nobody will believe that an ambitious journalistic boy threw them into the waste-basket after they were written. Unless we are grossly deceived, a large proportion of them appeared as "patriotic articles" in this city. The evasion all along in the columns of some of our contemporaries of any examination of the facts in the light of law, the daily threats to let our navy loose on the Chilians if they did not submit promptly, law or no law, the contempt heaped on their courts of justice, the unshaken belief that they were secretly preparing to fight us, and had men-of-war lying in wait in various creeks, bays, and coves around Cape Horn, in spite of their forlorn financial and military condition—all these were undoubtedly the product of a juvenile imagination fresh from tales of Indian adventure, lives of naval heroes and of noted pirates and buccaneers. In that happy land in which the boyish imagination loves to roam, fighting men never count the cost or haggle over the causes of a scrimmage. They never ask whether fighting will accomplish an object, for the fight is itself the object. They never inquire in what force the enemy is coming, but simply where he is, and the bigger his force the better they like it. That he is torn by such passions as hatred, and malice, and above all by envy, passes as a matter of course. Willingness to negotiate is the mark of a coward, and that the enemy should lie in his "false throat" every time he opens his mouth, is what might be expected from people who differ from the President of the United States. Not to support the President when he is "at quarters" stripped for action is the mark of "a traitor," and finally, a people of 60,000,000 must always be in the right in a dispute, else what would be the use of being 60,000,000? We have never happened, in truth, to come across stronger internal evidence of authorship than these Chilian articles afford. What a rattling "journalist" Master Scott will make at the age of twenty-one.

THE SAVINGS-BANK LAW.

THE officers of the principal savings banks of this State have again brought to the attention of the Legislature the severe restrictions imposed upon them by law in the choice of investments, the effect of which is to limit the rate of interest paid to the poorer classes on their savings to the minimum of about 3½ per cent. per annum. The principle upon which the present restrictions rest is a sound one. It assumes rightly that the classes who deposit their money in savings banks do not possess sufficient intelligence or commercial knowledge to form correct opinions on the soundness of securities or on the character of the men who manage these institutions, and hence that the State must intervene to prevent them from being duped and swindled. This is entirely wise and just. Without some such regulation, savings banks could not long exist. The poorly informed members of the community will put their money with those who offer the highest rate of interest and who tell the most plausible lies about the prosperity of their undertakings. Indeed, this tendency to run after smooth-talking rogues and to force money into their hands, especially if there is an air of mystery in their operations, is not peculiar to the unlettered classes. The Woman's Bank in Boston and the Grant & Ward "Bank" in New York are familiar and well-remembered illustrations of the openness to humbuggery of the higher circles of society. If the State had made arrangements by which the victims of Mrs. Howe and of Ferdinand Ward had been restricted in their investments to savings banks paying only 3½ per cent. interest, they would all be happier men and women, and the State Prison would not hold some of its present occupants.

The petition of the savings-bank presidents is very far from being radical. It asks permission to invest the money of depositors in the stocks or bonds legally authorized of any city incorporated under the laws of the State of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, or Missouri, having at the time of the investment more than fifty thousand inhabitants, as shown by the last Federal or State census next preceding the investment, and a total indebtedness, including the issue of stock or bonds in which the investment is made, not exceeding 7 per cent. of the valuation of the taxable property therein, as shown by the valuation thereof made for the assessment of taxes next preceding the investment. Other restrictions are embodied in the bill. If the city or the State in which it is situated has ever defaulted, the bonds cannot be taken. It is provided also that no savings bank shall invest more than 25 per cent. of its assets in the stocks or bonds of cities situated out of this State, or more than 2½ per cent. of its assets in the stocks or bonds of any one of such cities, or invest in more than 5 per cent. of all the stocks and bonds issued by any one of such cities, or make any investments in the stocks or bonds of any city situated out of this State which have been or shall be issued to aid in the construction of any railroad.

The law of the State at present allows investments in United States bonds or in the bonds of any State which has not defaulted within ten years, in bonds of counties and municipalities in this State, and in first mortgages on land in this State. Now the petition shows that the deposits in savings banks in this State on the 1st of January, 1892, amounted to upwards of $588,000,000, while all the outstanding bonds of the General Government, the States, and the principal cities of this State, amounted to only $887,000,000. The bulk of this sum ($649,000,000) consists of United States bonds for which the competition of the national banks and of trustees acting under orders of courts, not to mention life-insurance companies and private persons, is excessive. Leaving these out, there remains only $238,000,000

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of bonds of the kind allowed by law, and for these the competition of other investors is very keen. In addition is only the field of first-mortgage investment on land in this State. Such investments are not immediately available in times of panic; consequently the trustees of savings banks must be sparing in their choice of such securities. Moreover, they have to meet here the competition of life-insurance companies which are not affected by panics, since their liabilities fall due in a prescribed order.

We have never been able to understand the opposition to this moderate extension of savings-bank investments. The bill has been before the Legislature several winters in succession, and although recommended by the State Superintendents Hepburn, Paine, and Preston, and by the Chamber of Commerce of this city, it has always failed to become a law. The present petition tells us that "The only opposition to the bill comes from those who fear that an extension of the limit of investment will cause a rise in the rate of interest on municipal, town, county, and village bonds within this State, as the banks are now restricted largely to this class of investment." This is a very singular objection, applying, as it does, only to bonds hereafter to be issued. As to all bonds now outstanding the rate of interest is fixed. It will not be altered by the pending bill or by anything else. If that is the only objection to the bill, it ought not to weigh much against the interests of the million or more depositors in savings banks in the State.

THE GREAT AMERICAN NOVEL.

No impartial observer can have failed to note the decline, if not total disappearance, of the idea that a great American novel was bound to appear in the fulness of time, and that it might be looked for any day. This expectation was one of the fixed articles in the literary creed of the average American but a few years ago. It was like the anticipation of the golden age or the millennium — a belief more instinctive than reasoned, but all the stronger for that. Those more reflective spirits who paused to argue out the faith that was in them assured us that American culture had now reached, or was sure soon to reach, a stage when the requisite ability and the inspiration necessary were at command and were employed to so large a degree in the writing of novels that the happy combination was certain to be made some day, when the novel that could be called both great and American would come forth to meet the national aspiration and desire.

Nor did they leave us in ignorance of the marks by which we were to recognize that novel when we at last saw it. It was to be as fresh and radiant as a young giant, for one thing, without a suspicion of old-world weariness or despondency about it. Then it was to be as broad and fertile as the prairies, as sublime as the Rockies, as majestic as Niagara, yet withal winsome and tender, vigorous, strong, and brave—a work, in short, in which the whole land and all the inhabitants thereof should be presented in expressive epitome. With this idea and description of the novel that was to be, well in hand, there was a great deal of critical running to and fro and crying out "Lo here!" and "Lo there!" Now and then a positive critic or not too modest publisher would announce that he had finally got his hand on the great American novelist, but somehow that elusive creature always got away before the public caught sight of him. Such disappointments, repeated often enough, were certain to bring about a kind of old-world weariness on the part of those who had been so often deceived, and it is not strange that their faith has become slowly disintegrated. It is a long time now since we have heard or read a word about the coming of the great American novel.

Meanwhile, American fiction has distinctly forsaken the expansive and the illimitable to run after the contracted and the limited. Instead of a national novel, we now have a rapidly accumulating series of regional novels—or, rather, so far has the subdividing and minimizing process gone, of local tales, neighborhood sketches, short stories confined to the author's back-yard. Probably New England and New England character have had to undergo the extremest forms of this literary dissection. In one case the operator cut so ruthlessly through a nerve—we believe it was a Cape Cod nerve—that she was sued for libel, on the ground, we suppose, that her pictures of local eccentrics were, as the man said of a portrait of his mother-in-law, "deplorably like." But the process has not been confined to New England; what Miss Jewett and Mrs. Cooke and Mrs. Slosson and Miss Wilkins and all the others have done for that section of the country, has been essayed for the South by Mr. Cable and Mr. R. M. Johnston and Mr. Page and Miss Murfree and Matt Crim and Miss King, for the middle West by Mr. Howe and Mr. Garland, and so on. Indeed, it is becoming necessary for the novelist to hold himself down to a single minor specialty with the rigor of the German philologist who spent his life in the study of the Greek article, and died lamenting that he had not confined himself to the dative case of it. Thus one author has lately been congratulated by Mr. Howells for having so perfectly rendered the life of Philadelphia!

At the same time that American fiction has thus been leaving the prairies and taking up with a pasture, it has also, in some of its manifestations, grown a little shaky in its patriotism, and shown a sneaking liking for the effete monarchies of Europe, and a predilection for foreign themes in general. An English critic recently remarked upon the respect which certain novelists called forth for "their commercial agility." What he meant he explained as follows:

> "I mean the sedulous gentlemen with handbags who scour the earth for local color, bring it home, and deliver it at our doors. There is Mr. Marion Crawford, for instance—*in cœlum jusseris, ibit*—who, though by no means an old man, has already written with equal dexterity and truth of India, Hungary, Italy, Germany, England, and America. And perhaps we owe something more than our respect to him and his imitators. In childhood we used to be asked, apropos of cinnamon and spermaceti, by a Nursery Guide to Knowledge, 'Ought we not, as we consume these articles, to feel grateful to the mariners who procure and bring them at such risk from the ends of the earth?' So these writers compel our gratitude."

It must be confessed that at first sight this tendency of the modern American novel to cosmopolitanism or to parochialism bodes ill for the old dream of a comprehensive and purely native work of fiction that would embody, while it unified, all the diverse elements of our national character. Yet it may be that we are really on the road to that for the first time. Must not analysis precede synthesis? Is it not necessary to make a minute study of each local detail of character, before we can undertake a novel that shall be not one but all Americans' epitome? We throw out this suggestion to those who have abandoned the old philosophy of the American novel. If it be asked what one brain will be equal to grasping all the accumulated details and blending them into a harmonious whole, we reply, first, that there are possibilities in collaboration which have not been exhausted, and, second, that it would be peculiarly American to bring mechanical and labor-saving inventions into the service and creation of the great American novel. Are there not calculators and tabulators in the Census Office which work by electricity? There is a hint in that for the novelist of the future.

At any rate, we are firm believers in the doctrines of demand and supply, the man and the hour, and never despair of the republic. If a great American novel is a public necessity, come it will. Our philosophy in regard to it may be faulty, but if we only believe in the fact with sufficient stubbornness, and persist in expecting it and demanding it, one thing is certain—we shall not wake up some fine day and find that the great American novel was written and published years before without our knowing it.

"SIMULTANEITY" AND "EQUALITY" IN BRITISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

LONDON, March 8, 1892.

THE adoption of home rule by the Liberal party seven years ago took the average British elector somewhat by surprise. He had not been fully educated regarding the question: his mind had not been exposed to a gradual process of attrition, as had been the minds of the statesmen who had to bear the burthen and responsibility of Irish government. And when with such statesmen the remaining film of prejudice gave way, the elector was much in the state of mind in which the statesmen had

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been ten years before. The Conservatives carried the elections of 1886 on the cry of "No home rule," but perfect equality—"simultaneity and equality" with Great Britain in all matters relating to individual freedom and local administration in Ireland. Their pledges had up to the opening of the present session been redeemed by the imposition upon Ireland of a degrading and perpetual coercion act, and by a land act the discussion of which occupied much of last session, and which had fallen as flat as their bitterest opponents among the Irish party had predicted. True, such peace reigned in Ireland as had not reigned for fifteen years. But those who have any real knowledge of the country and its people—those not connected with the official classes and so cut off from all possibility of real knowledge—know that this peace is due not to coercion or fear of coercion, but to the ameliorative effect of far-reaching measures of land reform, to the impossibility of any people permanently maintaining such a fever heat of unrest as had been maintained, and to the calming influence of the certainty that the legitimate aspirations of the country would be fulfilled whenever the Liberals came back to power. A candid observer would be bound to admit that the Nationalists themselves materially contributed to the mistaken assumption that coercion had led to peace. Even they had not fully realized the calming effect upon the masses of the agricultural population of the reforms they themselves had effected. They overestimated the capacity of their countrymen for sustaining a condition of continued unrest, and for making sacrifices in protest against a system which, with Macchiavellian astuteness, was put in force so as to cause the maximum of appearance and elicit the minimum of opposition; and their insistence that increased coercion would in the present conjuncture be followed by greater unrest has not been justified. They were not, however, mistaken in the belief that Ireland in the long run would less than ever permanently submit to the system imposed upon her, that she had been educated up to a conception of her rights and what she owed to her self-respect, as she had never before been educated. They had not sufficiently borne in mind that hitherto she had carried forward her claims in wild outbreaks of passion succeeded by periods of disheartening lethargy, rather than by steady persistence. Protestants might be tempted to believe that she acted with less persistent stubbornness than a Protestant people would have done under similar circumstances.

So matters stood at the opening of the session. Mr. Balfour might yet redeem the promises of his party in the matter of equality, and vindicate his capacity for constructive statesmanship, as he had already shown his power to rule by bayonet and truncheon. The Tories and their Parnellite adherents, loud in their demands that Mr. Gladstone should lay before the country the details of the Home-Rule Bill he would introduce if he and his party came into office, made no such claim upon Mr. Balfour regarding local government, and up to the moment when he rose to propound his scheme, no one outside the Cabinet had any inkling of its provisions. It was possible he might wield the power he undoubtedly holds to pass a great and effective measure as an alternative to home rule. Never were those more justified who have all along maintained that the lithe being, so ready in debate, nonchalantly reclining on the Treasury bench, would be proved wanting in real statesmanship. Few who witnessed will ever forget the scene that passed as he unfolded his measure—the bursts of ironical cheers and laughter from the Irish benches, the amazement and amusement of the Liberals, the want of enthusiasm among his own followers; his own unintentional summing up of Conservative policy in the aphorism with which he half apologized for the provisions of his measure, that "It is often better to do a stupid thing that has been done before than a wise thing that has not been done before"; the half-scornful way in which he sought to cover the threadbare character of his proposals by saying that "after all it is not a measure to be compared in importance to the Crimes Act, the congested-districts provisions of the Land Act, or even the Light Railways Act of last session." Now, however, that we have the bill in print, newspaper-readers are likely to hear more about it, and it may be interesting to note its principal provisions.

To understand the present system of Irish local government by grand jury, and the proposed changes, it is well to bear in mind that as Irish land was brought under Anglo-Norman and British sway, it was divided into counties, and these counties into bailiwicks or baronies, aggregations of native *seisrachs*, or plough lands, now town-lands. We have 32 counties, 325 baronies (of varying number in each county and varying in size from 1,700 to 310,000 acres in extent), and 62,205 town-lands. Then, under the modern poor-law system, the county is divided into 163 unions. Local government of counties is now conducted by grand juries, practically selected by the High Sheriff, who is appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. They represent in effect a narrow ring of Protestant land-owners. They are transitory bodies, meeting only for a few hours twice a year, and having no power, except in the county of Dublin, to appoint committees or other bodies to look after the execution of work when they are out of session. The business is conducted by officials, the more important of them selected by the Lord Lieutenant. To a certain extent work is initiated in "presentment sessions," on the recommendation of the principal ratepayers, who are chosen under a complicated system of selection. Of the £1,400,000 county rates levied over Ireland, about half is spent by the grand juries on roads and bridges. The other half is levied peremptorily by Government and spent on lunatic asylums, extra police, and so forth. The taxes are raised off the occupiers. One of the prime abuses of the grand-jury system is the control of the levy and expenditure of money for malicious injuries to person and to property. Large sums are frequently drawn from the people upon the scantiest evidence that the outrage or the loss was malicious. Upon a recent occasion a drunken militiaman, quartered by the Government in a county to which he did not belong, assaulted and injured a policeman. Every ratepayer in that county had to contribute to him "blood money" compensation, although they were entirely innocent of offence towards him. For the widow of Inspector Martin, whose death was largely due to the infatuation of the Government in attempting the arrest of a priest after mass and in his canonicals, the grand jury of County Donegal levied £8,000 on an impoverished district.

As has been well said, "The notion always is that the way to teach these devils [the people] is to make them pay, and any public feeling against an outrage is soon lost in indignation at the means taken to avenge it." The Irish grand-jury system has for the past forty years been acknowledged to be entirely out of accord with all notions of representative government. The Poor Law is administered in unions by guardians, one-half of whom, *ex officio*, are practically appointed by the Crown. The municipal franchise in Irish towns, except in Belfast, is restricted as compared to the Parliamentary franchise. It is not, except in Belfast, extended to women, as it is in Great Britain. An Irish town has, generally speaking, not one-fourth or one-fifth the number of municipal votes of an English town of equal population. The control of the police and of education is vested in Dublin Castle.

Under Mr. Balfour's bill, the virtual control of the police and of education is to remain vested in the Lord Lieutenant. Beyond eleven of the principal towns, the urban franchise stands unreformed; the Government propose to retain the power of appointing half the members of the poor-law boards. The grand juries stand, and are to levy for malicious injuries. Half of the taxes are still to be levied and applied peremptorily under precept of the judges. It is proposed to constitute county councils, elected on the Parliamentary franchise, with peers and women ratepayers included; voting to be cumulative, illiterates being disfranchised. From the grand juries, from the poor-law boards, certain limited powers are to be taken and confided to these councils. There is nothing in the proposals to touch the imagination or call forth national or local patriotism. What is given with one hand is taken by the other. Initiative in all matters necessitating the expenditure of capital is left with the grand juries, or to a joint committee consisting half of grand jurors and half of county councillors. Boundaries and conflicting authorities overlap, as Mr. Knox, a rising young Irish member, pertinently remarks in an article in the *Speaker:*

"As there are many areas, so there will be many authorities. The intelligent voter will have to watch the fifteen baronial councillors for his barony meeting at one town, the Poor Law representatives for his Poor Law division meeting perhaps at another, the fifteen county councillors for his division of the county meeting at a third town, the sanitary committee for his sanitary district meeting somewhere else, not to speak of the other local authorities: the governors of the lunatic asylum and of the county infirmary, the drainage boards, and perhaps the harbor boards, all of which will have the power to increase the burden on the occupier. The popular local man who had to attend on all these local boards would never find time for any business of his own. The honest man would too often give up the work in hopeless disgust. If Mr. Balfour had been designing a scheme for the purpose of encouraging corruption, he could not have been more successful."

Worst of all, perhaps, we have an insulting and enervating system of checks and control never sought to be imposed upon similar assemblies in Great Britain. This is contained in the fifth clause of the bill, and provides for the removal of councillors by the High Court Judges, on the petition of twenty cess-payers, "on the ground of corruption, malversation, or oppression, or of persistent disobedience to the law." This proposal is additionally harsh in that judges in Ireland do not stand indifferently between classes, or between the people and the Crown, but are for the most part Government and class partisans, and chosen as such. A lawyer of nationalist or land-reform proclivities, no matter what his abilities, would have no chance of receiving the ermine. Clause 5, as it appears in the printed bill, is even more retrograde than as propounded by Mr. Balfour

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his introductory speech, in that while the rich would have the power of harrying an obnoxious county council, the poor would be deprived of the power of resisting oppression by the provisions as to security being given for costs of proceedings. Next to Mr. Morley's scathing denunciations, the most interesting passage in the preliminary discussion of the bill was that which occurred when Mr. Chamberlain declared that, after all, the powers given to two Irish judges by clause 5 were no stronger than those confided to Judges of the Supreme Court in the United States. Mr. Bryce's reminder of the essential difference of the two cases was crushing and effective. Within the limits of a communication such as the present, it would be difficult to make clear the complicated provisions of a bill under which it is further sought to maintain a system of bureaucratic government in Ireland under the semblance of representative institutions. Enough, perhaps, has been said to enable the readers of the *Nation* to follow the drift of the discussions likely to ensue—if, indeed, Mr. Balfour is really in earnest regarding the fate of his measure.

D. B.

RENAN'S 'DETACHED LEAVES.'—II.

PARIS, March 1, 1892.

MICHELET showed, in his last works, a curious sort of sensual sentimentality, that was almost a morbid form of senility. It is not uncommon to see a man, after having led a life of severe labor, end in this sort of sensualism, throwing an eye of envy and of regret at the past, and longing for the emotions and sensations of youth. Who has better described this state of mind than Goethe, at the beginning of his immortal 'Faust'? There was a Doctor Faust in Michelet, and there is one in Renan. All the dull work of exegesis has not killed in him the natural man; his philosophical dramas, "Caliban," "L'Eau de Jouvance," the "Prêtre de Nemi," and especially "L'Abbesse de Jouarre," show us a Renan very much occupied with the passion of love. One of these plays was given at the Théâtre Français, and Renan much enjoyed its representation, as well as the wonderful talent of one of the actors, Mlle. Reichenberg, the very type of the *ingénue;* somebody said cynically, after the performance, in the foyer, when Renan was paying his homage to Mlle. Reichenberg: "Is he going to spend upon Reichenberg the money he has made with the 'Life of Jesus'?"

Read, for instance, the first chapter of the new 'Detached Leaves'*; it is entitled "Emma Kosilis." "She was not of perfect beauty, but her face had an indescribable charm. Her eyes were exquisitely languorous; her eyelids, which expressed the most imperceptible quivers of timid modesty, seemed to have a soul. Her skin was so fine that the least acceleration of life betrayed itself by fugitive blushes—the sign of a secret which she did not reveal," etc. So Renan goes on, describing a little Breton girl. At the age of sixteen, Emma Kosilis falls in love with a young man of twenty, Émilien. The description of Emma Kosilis's state of mind is very subtle; a Darwinian would simply say that she was following the instincts of the species; Renan says it in other words:

"Emma's love was innocent as it was unconscious. . . . For whole days she remained motionless, abandoned to an amorous languor, which she enjoyed in perfect quietude, as one enjoys a warm breeze without asking whence it comes. . . . Naturally she said nothing of her feelings either to the man she loved, or to her family, or to her companions. . . . Her timid bearing made easy for her, without the slightest hypocrisy, that air of indifference and premeditated abstraction which is inculcated in young girls. What she felt was so vague, her imagination was so pure, the conversations which she was in the habit of hearing had always been so proper, that the idea never occurred to her that there was anything culpable in what she experienced. . . . Any hesitation as to the nature of what made her so happy, and of which she did not know the name, would have seemed in her eyes as sinful as a blasphemy against God, against the Church, against its sacraments."

The crisis came. She heard one day that Émilien was going to marry Mademoiselle ———. She herself, a few days afterwards, as lay-sister, entered the community of the Ursuline Dames, in the little town of ———. It seemed all very natural; she became a perfect Sister, though she never even tried to banish from her heart the thought of the beloved. "She did not distinguish her love from her piety, nor her piety from her love. Her austerities, especially, were penetrated by it. She found in them an extreme charm. Feeling instinctively that a woman must either enjoy or suffer, she found in mortifying her flesh a sort of ecstasy. She felt a deep joy in thinking that she suffered all this for the man whom she loved, and in telling herself that she would never look upon any other man than he. Her state of vague love drew from the long psalmodies of the convent a sort of powerful stimulant and augmentation." She did not, however, take the vow; for five years she lived in this sort of dream. The wife of Émilien died. Emma felt now a great agitation; the two young children of Émilien were sent to her convent; the father came to see them. They saw each other again, they understood each other without a word; and, shortly afterwards, they were married. She kept above her bed her nun's scourge. She often reminded her husband of what she had suffered for him, and how, during five years, she had mortified her flesh so as to keep her love; with his permission she wore haircloth on certain days. She was as the elect: "Quod habent desiderant."

This short story, written in the best style of Renan, is a perfect specimen of his method, or rather want of method. Nobody ever looked with more curiosity on what Darwin called the mystery of sexuality. Renan wants the man to be conscious, learned, without any superstition; the woman of his dreams is unconscious, ignorant, superstitious. If metempsychosis were a reality,

"I should ask, as a recompense for my brain-work, to come to life again as a woman, in order that I might study the two ways of living which the Creator has established, in order that I might comprehend the two poetries of things. I have reasoned and combined enough. I should like, in another world, to speak as a woman, with a woman's voice, to think as a woman, to love as a woman, to pray as a woman."

The same idea occurs in "The Double Prayer," one of the short chapters of the book: "I am astonished that no theologian has maintained that the prayers of men and of women are of a different quality. The two incenses, borne by the angels before the throne of the Eternal, would compose, as they burned, the perfect incense." Renan fancies that he heard in the Cathedral of Quimper a double chorus—that of the men and that of the women. The chorus of the women begins thus:

"O God, I believe firmly in Thy goodness, which causes our hearts to beat, overflows in our milk, fills our breasts, nourishes our little ones, causes the tranquil languor of our eyes, feeds our tenderness. We are sure that Thy spirit is in us, when our breasts swell; the palpitation of our bosoms is Thy voice."

I must confess that, without being prudish, I find such talk highly improper—this odd mixture of religiosity and sensualism. It is almost painful to see two such men as Michelet and Renan, at the end of honorable, severe, and laborious lives, indulge in thoughts and images which fill the minds of depraved and impatient adolescence. The whole of this "Double Prayer" is of the same sort: the men are dull and the women are not nice.

I find the same preoccupations in the chapter entitled "Love and Religion": "There is a great truth—the fundamental identity of religion and love. Yes, the Bible and the Gospels, wonderful books in so many respects, are particularly so for the manner in which the relations of the sexes are handled in them." Sensualism and optimism—these two words represent the synthesis of the long speculations of Renan. In a long article on Amiel he criticises him for the mournfulness of his doctrines:

"We must increase the sum of human happiness. We must speak no more of sin, of expiation, of redemption; we must speak to man of gayety, of goodness, of indulgence, of good humor, of resignation. As the hope of a future life goes on diminishing, we must accustom these transient beings to consider life as supportable; otherwise they will revolt. Man can no longer be kept quiet except by happiness."

Is it so easy to give happiness to mankind? Is it enough to offer to us the pleasures of imagination? "All men," says Renan, "have imagination, that is to say, supreme joy, the enchantments which never grow old; with the exception of a few pathological cases, there is no life so gloomy that some ray of sunshine does not penetrate it."

Renan drifts, as you see, into the doctrine of Epicurus, only he is not the Epicurean of the old school, with his head crowned with roses; he is more sentimental, more idealistic, more of a dreamer.

"The most dangerous error in social ethics is the systematic suppression of pleasure. Rigorously correct virtue is an aristocracy; everybody is not equally bound thereto. . . . It is necessary that the masses should amuse themselves. For my own part, I have no need of external amusement; but I do need to feel that people are amusing themselves around me; I enjoy the gayety of others. Temperance societies are founded upon excellent intentions, but upon a misunderstanding. . . . Instead of suppressing drunkenness for those who require it, would it not be better to try to make it gentle, amiable, accompanied by moral sentiments? There are so many men for whom the hour of drunkenness is, after the hour of love, the moment when they are at their best."

Here we have a very candid expression of the new Epicureanism I was speaking of. I ask myself at times if there is not a perpetual irony in the sermons of Renan; does he not say: "We owe virtue to the Eternal; but we have the right to join to it, as a personal retort, irony. We play the farce which has been played to us. . . . We wish the Eternal to feel that, if we agree to be deceived, we agree to it willingly and knowingly. We are resigned to lose the interest of our virtuous investments; but we would not like to be exposed to the ridicule of seeming to have counted much upon it."

Such language is not edifying; there is something really unbecoming in this perpetual antagonism between Renan and the Eternal, playing tricks on each other, on a footing of intellectual equality; and at times Renan would almost make us believe that there is no equality, that the advantage is on the side of man,

*'Recollections and Letters.' Translated by Isabel F. Hapgood. New York: Cassell Publishing Co.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he regains in acuteness of perception and of wit what he necessarily loses in time and space. Man is finite, but his finiteness condenses what is spread for the Eternal in the infinite.

I doubt if such speculations can do any good to anybody. I can better understand the "Philosophical Examination of Conscience," which ends the volume, for here we are in the domain of pure metaphysics, though even there Renan seems to be haunted by his usual thoughts, by his perpetual visions. He makes us think, at times, of Saint Anthony tempted in his solitude. Speaking of love, he says:

"The time during which man loves is the time of his fugitive life when he is at his best. The immense sensation which he feels when he thus emerges, in a manner, from himself, shows that he really comes in contact with the infinite. Love, understood in a lofty manner, is thus a religious thing, or rather a part of religion. Is it possible that this old remnant of relationship with nature could have been regarded by frivolity and folly as a shameful remainder of animalism? Is it possible that an aim so holy as that of continuing the species could have been attached to a culpable or ridiculous act? We attribute to the Eternal, by this supposition, a grotesque intention."

I have said enough: this new volume, though it is written in some parts with rare delicacy, though the choice of words is of the rarest, though some of its parts are highly poetical, has left me under an almost painful impression. I regret to find so much weakness in such a solid intellect; there are thoughts which ought never to be spoken; there are secrets which ought never to be told. As "full many a flower is born to blush unseen," full many dreams of imagination ought to vanish in silence and night.

Correspondence.

A MYTH OF THE CONFEDERACY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The following sample of what I may venture to call the *ex-post-facto* manufacture of history, considering the respectability of the magazine in which I find it seems to call for an early and complete contradiction.

In the *New England Magazine* for November, 1891, in an article entitled "Why the South was Defeated in the Civil War," by Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, we find the following:

"A much more amusing case is that of Jones County, Mississippi. The 3,300 people of this county became tired of the burdens of the civil war, and by a convention held in 1862 formally seceded from the State and Confederacy.

"'Whereas, The State of Mississippi, for reasons which appear justifiable, has seen fit to withdraw from the Federal Union; and, whereas, we, the citizens of Jones County, claim the same right, thinking our grievances are sufficient by reason of an unjust law passed by the Confederate States of America, forcing us to go to distant parts,' etc.

"'Therefore, be it resolved, that we sever the union heretofore existing between Jones County and the State of Mississippi, and proclaim our independence of the said State and of the Confederate States of America; and we solemnly call upon Almighty God to witness and bless the act.'

"A resolution offering their alliance to the United States was not adopted. The sovereign nation of Jones County, with its President, Cabinet, Congress, code of laws, and conscription and confiscation acts—nailed to trees, since there was no newspaper in the commonwealth—was able for some time to maintain itself in the midst of the swamps against the troops sent to subdue it. Finally, by the aid of field-guns, the infant commonwealth was overcome, and the authority of the Confederacy was restored."

As Prof. Hart premised, this was an amusing case of the ultimate application of the logic of secession. But, as I was active in those days, and became an officer of the army which invaded the State of Mississippi, and as I have a good memory of the current news of those times, I began to wonder that I could not remember so remarkable an event. I began to doubt the story. I addressed a note to Prof. Hart asking for the contemporary authority for the story. Not receiving an answer, I wrote to the County Clerk of Jones County and to the Governor of Mississippi. They courteously responded in a few days. E. B. Sharp, Esq., Chancery Clerk, says: "The report . . . is entirely false in every particular." Gov. Stone sent me the following letter, enclosing a second statement from his predecessor, Gov. Lowry:

State of Mississippi,
Executive Department,
Jackson, January 22, 1892.

Dr. Samuel Willard, Chicago:

My Dear Sir: I am in receipt of your letter of the 15th inst. in reference to the remarkable statements in regard to Jones County, in this State, and it affords me pleasure to inform you that the whole story is a fabrication, and there is scarcely any foundation for any part of it. To begin with, Jones County furnished perhaps as many soldiers to the army of the Confederacy as any other county of a like population. A large portion of the population of the county was composed of illiterate persons who had been reared in the interior, far from railroads and other means of transportation, and mainly without schools. Many of them declined to go into the army in the beginning, but so far as any formal withdrawal or resolution to that effect is concerned, no such thing ever occurred in Jones County. There were a good many who deserted from the Confederate army and returned to their homes in Jones County, and they, with others who had refused to go into the service, did join together in little bands to protect themselves against the conscript officers, and resisted the authority of the Confederate Government; but there was no general organization of such character; it was simply small squads of deserters and other persons who determined not to go into the army if they could avoid it. Many of them were arrested and put into the army, and afterwards performed faithful service to their commands.

I enclose herewith a letter from my immediate predecessor, Hon. Robert Lowry, who was Governor of the State for eight years, his term ending two years ago, who was sent to Jones County during the war for the purpose of arresting and returning these deserters to their commands. He informs me that many arrests were made, and many came voluntarily and surrendered to him and returned to the service. There was some little fighting with these bands of deserters, or rather, bushwhacking of his men by the deserters; and some of the deserters were arrested, tried, and executed; but only a few. The whole story is the veriest fabrication, and I presume few persons of intelligence will believe any of it.

Thanking you for an opportunity of correcting this slander upon one of our counties, I have the honor to be, with great respect,

Your obedient servant,
J. M. Stone, Governor of Mississippi.

The enclosure, Gov. Lowry's letter, in part describes the county of Jones as it was before the war, and as it now is, with a railroad and a prosperous trade in cotton, lumber, and turpentine, and in part deals directly with the question in hand. He says:

"The county furnished nearly and probably its entire quota of soldiers, many of whom did splendid service. Quite a number deserted, and only returned when captured by a regular command. No such effort as establishing a separate government was ever attempted. The men who ran away from the army in the field were ignorant persons, and most of them under the leadership of Newton Knight, and their main object was to get back to their homes and to avoid being caught and returned to their respective commands. Knight was an ignorant, uneducated man. The story of withdrawal and establishing a separate government is a pure fabrication—not the shadow of foundation for it."

I think the testimony I have elicited disposes of the fiction completely, and yet I fear it will run a long while on the credit of Prof. Hart of Harvard and the *New England Magazine*.

Yours truly, Samuel Willard.

Chicago, March 7, 1892.

THE ELEVATION OF BLACK AMERICANS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Since the refusal of the South to permit of Federal interference either with the education or elective franchise of the negro, his Northern friends have naturally concluded that nothing in the way of legislation could be done to aid him. With the demise of the Blair Bill and Force Bill, there has sprung up a growing conviction that the South must solve its own problem. Discussion of the negro question has ceased for the time being. Northern ignorance and Southern apathy concerning his condition are enlightened and aroused only by occasional outbreaks which excite public attention and sympathy for the moment.

Such an outbreak, which throws light upon the true state of affairs in the South, is the movement of a large number of negroes from the Indian Territory and Arkansas to New York, expecting to colonize in Liberia. This movement appeals directly to the citizens of New York. But it is not so much the fact that we must exercise Southern hospitality towards these transient visitors, nor the outrageous misrepresentations of the American Colonization Society as to existing conditions in Liberia, but rather the ignorance and destitution of the Southern negro, which make such an imposition possible, that claims our attention. A talk with these negroes, or, better still, a trip through the South, including a visit in the slums of the cities or in the cabins on the plantations, will make the point still more clear. The visitor will view things differently from the Southerner, who puts up with the negro as best he can, laughing at his ignorance and cursing his stupidity. The fact that other men's chickens and other men's wives are common property among the negroes seems strange to the visitor, but the Southerner does not notice it until his own possessions are encroached upon.

The South is many millions poorer this year on account of the low price of cotton, and the negro is the last to receive sympathy in his poverty and destitution. The establishment of manufactories in East Tennessee and northern Alabama helps the negro but little, as the labor required is either imported or almost entirely white skilled workmen. Those upon whom the negro is directly dependent are most limited in means, and it now appears that the South is not able to solve its own problem. Nor can the millennium for the negro be brought about by statute. Because the South, with faith in the future proportionate with her success since the war, does not ask for Federal aid, this is no reason why individuals in more prosperous sections should not feel themselves in duty bound to aid his former masters in emancipating the negro from ignorance, abject poverty, and moral degradation. Nor can this emancipation be secured by proclamation. Systems must be devised and institutions established whereby influences and agencies will be set in operation which, *generation after generation*, will raise the standard of his intellectual and moral life and make him an important factor in the great industrial developments now promised in the South.

It is possible that a clear statement of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

urgent need of the negro, and a suggestion as to the practical line along which the remedy lies, may find some one prepared to push along a work that now lags. These are days big with opportunity for opulent philanthropy to immortalize itself. The cause of the college and the church has received substantial aid from generous men of wealth. The fact that this philanthropy has been exercised so frequently and so wisely is one excuse for the present industrial conditions which concentrate the wealth of the nation in the hands of the few. Persecution in Russia presented urgent claims, and philanthropy answered. Now pestilence and famine stretch out parched tongues and wasted fingers for those necessities which a sympathizing world hastens to supply. The crowded tenements of our great cities have received attention, and philanthropy has drawn vice and squalor out into the sunlight. Whatever the motive—be it for sweet charity's sake, to so bequeath an estate as to leave an undying name, or to claim honor as the founder of some institution of learning or the originator of some social system—it is a laudable ambition, and the fact remains that the needs of the hour are being met with cheerfulness and promptness.

For the evils which now beset the African race in the South the surest remedy lies in some agency which shall purify their home life. Remove the negro girl from the one-room cabin where all members of a large family eat and sleep, and surround her for a period of four to six years with the influences and environments of an *industrial* institute and college, with modern methods and equipments, and the corner-stone of African civilization is laid in the *home*. If it were possible to establish these institutions for negro girls generally throughout the South, the next generation would date their emancipation from the initiation of this movement. There are several poorly equipped industrial schools for negroes in the South, where the results for good are small because the students return each day to the degrading influences of their own homes. There is a crying need for boarding-schools for negro girls, where the moral refinements and practical advantages of domestic life can be instilled into them day after day and year after year. In the homes of the whites such women would be treasures as servants; or, as mistresses of their own homes, they would be blessings to the race.

Here is the opportunity for practical philanthropy to make a beginning. R. E. L.

New York, March 5, 1892.

A WORD WITH "G. B."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have always read "G. B.'s" letters with interest, and that of last week on "Parties and the Nation" is especially definite and suggestive. I am not sure the results of the change he proposes would equal his expectations; but why not try it in Massachusetts? Why should he not prepare a bill embodying this reform, have it introduced in the Legislature, and try to secure its adoption? It is easy to put any substantial idea into the minds of the people of a State, if it can be clearly expressed, to concentrate their attention upon it and obtain their assent or disapproval. This is the quickest and surest way to find out what the people will approve after adequate examination and discussion. I am inclined to think that "the root of the trouble" is not wholly "in the defective organization of the Government business," but partly in the average character and civilization of the people of our country. This is something deeper than its special manifestations in politics. We need a more direct study and analysis of American civilization than has yet been undertaken. The character of the people expresses itself more and more fully through all our methods of Government business and all our forms of political action. No system or agency can long keep our politics much above or below the level of our national character, and it is at least a question whether any change in methods or machinery would eliminate the essential elements of the stage of civilization which we have reached. J. B. Harrison.

Franklin Falls, N. H., March 16, 1892.

A NEGLECTED LITERATURE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In examining the biographical portion of the new 'International Dictionary,' I have been very much surprised at the omission of three of the most important names in recent Danish literature: Drachmann, Schandorph, and Jacobsen. Hundreds of names are given of far less note in European literature. This omission is especially noteworthy in the case of Drachmann, who is, without doubt, Denmark's greatest living man of letters. Is it not true that England and America, in their enthusiasm for the new literatures of the Continent, have strangely neglected Denmark? This little country is just now in a veritable fever of intellectual activity and literary production, or rather over-production. It is not in Norway alone that the impulse given by Björnson and Ibsen to Northern letters, has made itself felt. The three above-mentioned writers, together with Brandes, Rudolf Schmidt, Skram, Schjoerring, and some others, have attained a degree of literary merit that ought to gain for contemporary Danish literature not only the respect, but also the attention, of other nations. I doubt if there can be found, outside of France, a more promising and enjoyable field of investigation for the lover of the new and elegant and realistic in fiction and in verse. This fact has already begun to be recognized in Germany, where numerous translations from the Danish are being issued, and where belletristical journals abound in studies of the new Danish literature. In England and America, however, this literature is practically a *terra incognita*, except to the few who read Dano-Norwegian. So far as my knowledge goes, not a single one of Drachmann's books has been translated into English.

There are several reasons for this neglect. In the first place, these Danish writers are intensely national. Drachmann's 'Derovre Fra Graensen' is one of the most "national" compositions in literature. Another reason is that this new literature has had no advocate with us. Gosse has confined himself to Norway and to the older Danish writers. The same may be said of Boyesen. Anderson is interested rather in the ancient writings of the North, although his 'Literature' has introduced us, at least, to some of the new writers of Denmark. Again, Dano-Norwegian is very little studied here in America, and is supposed to be exceedingly difficult. It is, however, no very great task to acquire a reading knowledge of this language, especially for one who reads German. In any case, I trust that the time is not far distant when some enterprising publisher will make it possible for English readers to enjoy, in good translations, the more important of the literary productions of "Young Denmark." Mitchell Bronk.

Crozer Theological Seminary,
Chester, Pa., March 7, 1892.

AN UNKNOWN WRITER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Some months since I received two monographs (manuscripts) on or about the same day, one of which was from a friend with whom I am in constant intercourse, who desired me to review it. They were laid aside for lack of time at the moment; but upon being subsequently urged, I very carefully read the longest one, and found it to be one of the ablest treatises upon the tariff question that I have ever read or been called upon to revise. Believing this to be the one that my friend had sent me, I returned it to him, when to my surprise he said that it was not his; that he concurred with me in my judgment of its merits, and that he thought it ought to be published. Now I am very much troubled. The manuscript in question was anonymous. It was not accompanied by any letter or request for examination, and I therefore cannot identify the correspondent from whom it came. I know not what to do with it, as in the time that has elapsed no one has written to me upon the subject. I ask for this notice in the *Nation*, in the hope that the writer will make himself known. The title of the paper is "Protection," and it begins with an introductory paragraph from an article by Cardinal Gibbons, in the *North American Review* for April, 1891. I am, yours respectfully,

David A. Wells.

Norwich, Conn., March 16, 1892.

VOLTAIRE, NOT PHILLIPS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: "Of course errors about matters of oral tradition are to be dealt with leniently, but they ought to be pointed out before they crystallize into the 'lies agreed upon,' which Mr. Wendell Phillips says constitute what we call history."

Voltaire had written ('Jeannot et Colin'): "Il n'y a certainement d'agréable et d'utile que l'histoire du jour; toutes les histoires anciennes, comme le disait un de nos beaux esprits, ne sont que des fables convenues."

A. I.

New Bedford, Mass., March 18, 1892.

Notes.

Prof. Romanes's book, 'Darwin and after Darwin,' is to be brought out in the United States by the *Open Court* Publishing Company of Chicago. The work will appear in England and this country simultaneously.

Fresh stories of Brer Rabbit and the other brethren are promised, together with some autobiographic matter, in Joel Chandler Harris's new book, 'On the Plantation,' which is at once to be published by the Appletons, with illustrations by E. W. Kemble.

Harper & Bros. announce for immediate publication 'Love-letters of a Worldly Woman,' by Mrs. W. K. Clifford; 'Monsieur Henri, a Foot-note to French History,' by Louise Imogen Guiney; and Mr. Howells's latest novel, 'The Quality of Mercy.'

The expiration of the copyright on 'The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scarlet Letter' brings with it the announcement of two cheap editions, one by the Waverly Company of New York and the other by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston. From either firm the book may be had in paper at twenty-five cents and in cloth at fifty cents. The last-named publishers will also speedily issue 'The Unseen Friend,' by Lucy Larcom. March 23 was the date of issue of the first number of a new religious quarterly, the *New World*, published by the same house.

Thought News is to be the title of a new monthly, of which the first number is to appear in April, and which is to be published at Ann Arbor, Mich., under the editorial care of Prof. John Dewey.

Macmillan & Co. promise for early April two fully illustrated volumes on the 'Remains of Ancient Rome,' by Prof. J. Henry Middleton. They are also to publish on March 29 Tennyson's new play, "The Foresters," now running at Daly's Theatre in this city. They announce, furthermore, a monthly issue of the more popular novels of Dickens in their "Dollar Series," starting off with 'Pickwick' in March, 'Oliver Twist' in April, etc. Accurate reproduction of the text of the first editions is promised, with all the original illustrations, and an introduction to each volume by the novelist's eldest son.

The Government "Atlas to accompany the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies" proceeds with a second and third part which embrace the defences of Washington, of Paducah, Ky.; Northeastern Virginia, from Washington to the Potomac; the battlefields of Carnifix Ferry, West Va., Pea Ridge, Ark., Shiloh, Tenn., Roanoke Island, N. C., Forts Henry and Donelson; the neighborhood of Corinth, Miss.; the siege of Yorktown, and sundry other maps, surveys, reconnoissances, and sketches.

If one overlooks the faulty style, sometimes resulting in nonsense, of Dr. P. C. Remondino's 'The Mediterranean Shores of America' (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Co.), he may derive no little instruction from it regarding Southern California as a health resort. The author maintains and illustrates forcibly the thesis that an equable temperature, permitting free ventilation, is the prime anti-phthisical condition, quite irrespective of altitude, humidity, rainfall, etc. He also indicates the great variety of situations and climates in Southern California, suitable not only for different kinds of invalids, but for invalids whose cases appear to be the same, yet who do not thrive equally well on the same spot. The book is freely but somewhat capriciously illustrated with views, and also with maps and sections.

M. Jules Lemaitre has just gathered into a volume a fifth collection of his studies of modern French literature and modern French life, still called 'Les Contemporains' (Paris: Lecène, Oudin & Cie.; New York: F. W. Christern), although the rigidity of the formal portrait-essay is now relaxed and the papers here presented are often fragmentary. There is the same wit, however, the same honesty, the same exceeding cleverness, the same highly interesting exhibition of the mind of a nineteenth-century Parisian, cultivated almost to the point of reaction. Among the literary men considered in this fifth series are M. de Maupassant, M. André Theuriet, M. Édouard Rod, and M. Paul Marguéritte—this last a most promising novelist not yet as well known in America as he ought to be. Outside of literature are brilliant little papers on Boulanger, on the philosophy of dancing, and on exiled emperors. More than half of the book is given up to the delightful "Billets du Matin," contributed to the *Temps* two years ago, and constituting a pleasant variation on the accepted form of the *chronique*. Easy, graceful, learned, charming—these *billets du matin* give an impression of Parisian society quite different from that derived, say, from the *Figaro* or the *Vie Parisienne*.

After an interval of several years, M. Francisque Sarcey has at last followed his 'Souvenirs de Jeunesse' with a volume of 'Souvenirs d'Âge Mûr' (Paris: Ollendorff; New York: F. W. Christern), reprinted from the *Revue Bleue*, where the earlier chapters appeared under the title of "Comment je deviens conférencier." Perhaps this is a better title than that the book actually bears, for the volume is devoted wholly to M. Sarcey's experience as a lecturer in Paris, in the provinces, in Holland and Belgium, in London. Like all his writing, it is delightfully frank, easy, humorous, and engaging. It abounds in anecdotes, many of which tell against the teller. It includes one whole chapter given up to an explanation of the lecturer's art, and setting forth, for the benefit of the novice, the rules which experience has taught M. Sarcey to devise for his own use. It provides material for a very piquant comparison of the old New England lyceum lecturer and the Parisian *conférencier*. Especially interesting is M. Sarcey's account of the methods of other French lecturers, of M. Legouvé, for example. Altogether, his 'Souvenirs d'Âge Mûr' (like his 'Souvenirs de Jeunesse,' for that matter) is as instructive as it is amusing.

'Brighter South Africa' (London: T. Fisher Unwin), by J. Ewing Ritchie, is a pleasantly written description of a short visit to the Cape and Natal. The most interesting chapters are those in which the writer gives the prevalent views of the colonists on such subjects as their relations to Great Britain, the treatment of the natives, and temperance legislation. Some light, also, is thrown upon the religious conditions, and especially upon the peculiar position of the Church of England in Natal. There is an excellent map, in which the places of the various products of the country are distinctly shown. Among these the gold fields are very prominent, but in view of Mr. Bent's statement of the immense tracts both of alluvium and quartz which have been worked by the ancient miners, the question naturally arises whether the gold, in Mashonaland at least, may not have been practically exhausted ages ago.

Dr. Bourinot is a recognized authority in everything pertaining to Canadian institutions. The first edition of his work on 'Parliamentary Procedure' had already so high a reputation as a trustworthy compendium of the law and practice that a new, revised, and enlarged edition (Montreal: Dawson Bros.) must at once take position as a standard book of reference on his subject. His historical chapters on the growth and changes of the government in Canada from the period of the French colony downward will prove instructive for American readers. As a study in comparative parliamentary law the book will be valuable to parliamentarians everywhere. As evidence of Canadian progress in bookmaking, the volume shows that in typography, press-work, paper, and general make-up, our neighbors need not fear comparison with the product of the best presses here or elsewhere.

From John W. Lovell Co. we have received the first three volumes of a complete translation, by Mr. Charles G. Leland, of Heine's poetic and prose works. Hardly a greater service could be done to American literature than to appropriate for it a writer who in breadth of sympathies, keenness of judgment, and irreverence of language seems to be our own, while his German romanticism and waywardness add to this that indescribable personal charm which we miss so sadly in most of our stout modern realists. While it must be said that the only true translator of Heine would be another Heine (which the present translator is not), it is only fair to admit that Mr. Leland has approached his difficult task courageously and with a good deal of spirit. The three volumes which lie before us contain among other essays and sketches the 'Florentine Nights,' the 'Rabbi of Bacharach,' the 'Book le Grand,' the 'Pictures of Travel'; and throughout this variegated and multiform matter there runs, even in the translation, something of the electric current from which flash forth the sparks of the original production. It is a pity that an author of Mr. Leland's power of reproductive imagination should not have had a little more scholarly conscience. For it is only to the lack of the latter that we can ascribe the frequent occurrence of most elementary blunders, some of them grotesque enough to form the *pièce de résistance* of a freshman blue-book. We subjoin, without further comment, a few of them—the gleanings of a hasty reading. "Profaxen und andere Faxen" (Pict. of Trav. i., 59) = professors ordinary and extraordinary. "Verjüngter Maasstab" (ib. ii., 8) = revived proportions. "Reifröcke" (ib. 9) = travelling jackets. "Jene Bretter die eine Festung bedeuten" (ib. 67; an allusion, of course, to the "Bretter die die Welt bedeuten") = planks which lead to a prison. "Die aufgeklärten Bäuche, denen jene Messgewänder viel zu weit" (ib. p. 259) = the enlightened bellies, a world too wide for the chasubles—etc., etc.

The sixth and closing paper of the series on Britannic Confederation in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* is by Lord Thring, formerly Parliamentary Counsel. It is an interesting statement of the present relations of the Colonies, as distinct from the Dependencies, to the mother country, together with a few suggestions as to the manner in which the bonds can be drawn closer. As the whole trade of the United Kingdom with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Cape Colony is less than 12 per cent. of her foreign trade, the writer scouts the idea that it should give up free trade for protection, but holds that they should alter their commercial relations in the direction of free trade. He also advocates, with Sir John Colomb, the formation of an Imperial army and navy, apart from the British army and navy, to which each colony should contribute men and ships, to be used in the colony in case of attack, but not for foreign service except with their own consent. Among minor details are the elevation of the Agent-General to a position akin to that of a minister of a foreign State, freer postage, and the interchange of the civil services. Illustrative of the whole series is an excellent map of the world so colored as to show not only the extent of the empire, but also the countries in which it has a monopoly of the foreign commerce (more than 50 per cent. of the imports and exports combined), British-owned steamship lines, naval and coaling stations, as well as all places in which are British legations, consuls, or vice-consuls.

The double fascicule of the *Bulletino della Società Dantesca Italiana* (September, 1891) contains a report of progress from the committee appointed, at the organization of the socie-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ty in 1889, to prepare a new uniform text of Dante's complete works. Prof. Michele Barbi, to whom the 'Vita Nuova' and the 'Rime' were assigned, is already well along in the preparation of the former, and Profs. Bartoli, D'Ancona, and Del Lungo publish in this number a "canon" of doubtful readings, which will serve as tests for MSS. of the 'Divine Comedy,' with explicit directions for their use. The society has also taken in charge an excellent plan, originating with the late Lord Vernon, of collecting photographs and other adequate reproductions of the various places and objects commemorated in the great poem. The prospectus includes more than two hundred subjects, the materials for illustrating a third of which are already at hand.

Societies founded for the special encouragement of the study of Dante's works and time have not as a rule been long-lived. The most famous has been the *Deutsche Dante Gesellschaft*, whose Year Books contained a large amount of valuable matter. The oldest in existence is that which naturally grew up at Cambridge under the influence of Longfellow, Lowell, and Norton, and was definitely established in 1880, since which date it has annually published reports with accompanying essays or bibliographies. Next (1889) came the Italian Dante Society, whose Bulletin is mentioned above, with its headquarters in Florence and branches in various cities throughout the kingdom. Last is the "American Dante Society"—located in this city, with branches in Brooklyn and Philadelphia—whose Year Book for 1890-1, now before us, shows a membership of considerably over two hundred. It also contains addresses before the Society by Drs. M. R. Vincent, Thomas Davidson, and W. T. Harris. A sum has been set apart from the treasury for the purchase of books for the library of the Society, which, for readiness of access, is to be placed in charge of some public institution.

The mail from Holland brings news of the death of Dr. Frederik Gerrit Slothouwer, a scholar well known to all Americans who have visited Friesland, and especially Leeuwarden, in the interest of research. He wrote the history of the University of Franeker—whose professors and students so actively influenced Dutch opinion favorably to American independence—and other historical works. At the time of his death he was Professor in the Gymnasium and Secretary in several languages for the Friesland Historical and Archæological Society.

We have before spoken of the influence of Toynbee Hall in getting the ratepayers of the Whitechapel district in London to vote for a free public library, and now have to record the gift of £6,454 by Mr. Passmore Edwards, to meet the estimated cost of the library building. Other subscriptions in hand will pay for the site, the fittings, and the books to begin with, so that the whole of the tax levied can be devoted to the working expenses and the development of the library.

—The second volume of the so-called national edition of the works of Galileo Galilei (Florence: Barbèra), published under the auspices of the King of Italy and with the aid of funds voted by the Italian Parliament, is considerably stouter than its predecessor, to which we called attention about a year ago. In this second instalment of the monumental work, the editor, Prof. Favaro, fully sustains the reputation he had acquired for critical discernment, excellent taste, and exact and many-sided scholarship. It contains a number of treatises embodying the results of researches made while Galileo was professor at Padua, between 1592 and 1610, and never before printed. During this period he delivered a course of lectures on military science, and especially on fortification, which attracted unusual attention, and there is a tradition that Gustavus Adolphus as a youth of fourteen came to Padua to profit by this instruction. According to the testimony of Oxenstiern, the Swedish prince showed remarkable knowledge of the science of war before he ascended the throne in the seventeenth year of his age, and the legend may have originated in an attempt to account for this precocity. These lectures, in which Galileo treats the subject as a branch of applied mathematics and anticipated by three-quarters of a century the principle so successfully employed by Vauban in the polygonal construction of bastion fortifications, have been preserved in only a few manuscripts, and are now published with the original geometrical drawings for the first time. The rest of the volume consists of treatises on mechanics, including statics and dynamics, the second part of the essay *De Motu*, and fragments of discourses on astronomy, with the "Dialogue Concerning the New Star" (of 1604), which, although bearing the name of Cecco Di Ronchitti, was essentially the work of Galileo. Exceedingly interesting is Galileo's letter of March 30, 1597, to his old instructor at Pisa, Jacopo Mazzoni da Cesena, who, in a treatise *De Comparatione Aristotelis et Platonis*, had set himself in opposition to the Copernican system, and is very politely, but quite decidedly, refuted by his former pupil. Galileo's invention of the sector in 1597 was contested by a rival astronomer and bitter enemy, Baltasare Capra, who had the effrontery to claim this distinction for himself. Prof. Favaro has published the documents referring to this controversy, including Capra's pamphlet with Galileo's marginal annotations and a separate defence of his rights by the latter, who denounces his adversary as a slanderer and swindler. The practical value of the volume is greatly enhanced by a complete index of proper names.

—The strong feeling excited by the forced retirement of Prince Bismarck has given rise to a voluminous literature of which he is the central figure. Many of these works are polemical and partisan pamphlets of an ephemeral character, while others are the result of thorough research and have a permanent value. Of the latter class the most important is perhaps Horst Kohl's 'Fürst Bismarck, Regesten zu einer wissenschaftlichen Biographie des ersten Deutschen Reichskanzlers' (Leipzig: Renger, 1891; vol. i., pp. xii., 418). The first volume contains a succinct chronological record of all the acts of Bismarck relating to public affairs on nearly every day of the year from 1815 to 1871. The usefulness of such a register of the life of an eminent statesman, as a book of reference and as a storehouse of facts for biographical and historical purposes, is obvious, and will be fully appreciated by all who have had occasion to look up information of this kind. Of special interest to rhetoricians is Hugo Blümmer's 'Der bildliche Ausdruck in den Reden des Fürsten Bismarck' (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1891; pp. vi., 198). The Zurich professor has studied Bismarck's speeches from 1847 to 1889 with sole reference to their rhetorical character, collecting and classifying the most striking imagery, similes, metaphors, historical, literary, and poetical allusions, proverbial phrases, tropes suggested by popular customs or derived from social and domestic life, and other forms of oratorical decoration and illustration. Many, and indeed most, of these figures are, of course, not original with the German Chancellor, but the common property of mankind; characteristic of him is his uniformly happy choice of them. The work is thoroughly well done. Fortunately for Prof. Blümmer's purpose, the speeches of Bismarck have been published in sixteen small octavo volumes, entitled 'Fürst Bismarck als Redner' (Stuttgart). It is a complete collection of his parliamentary speeches since 1847, edited and chronologically arranged according to subjects, with notes and introductions by W. Böhm and A. Dove. Another earlier edition of the same statesman's speeches, designed to give a connected survey of his political career and parliamentary triumphs, is Friedrich Thudichum's 'Bismarcks parlamentarische Kämpfe und Siege' (Stuttgart). It is in two volumes and is intended chiefly to justify the Imperial Chancellor's policy as embodied in the legislative enactments with which his name is identified, and only incidentally to illustrate his characteristics as an orator. It would be strange if the German muse should fail to sing the praises of Bismarck, but ballad-doggerel like Rudolf Genée's 'Bismarckiade fürs deutsche Volk' (Berlin: Hofmann) is anything but a worthy expression of national gratitude and admiration. Less ambitious and really enjoyable is 'Ein Märchen vom Bismarck und der Kaiserkrone' (Frankfort: Rommel), in which an anonymous author has made a successful attempt to narrate for children the achievements of Bismarck in the style of the sagas.

—It is a prevalent opinion that common schools, as we now have them, were an American invention. No legislation, it is asserted, taxing all in order that all may be taught can be traced back further than to the early laws of Massachusetts. Those who deny this assertion are content with showing something of the sort in Scotland and Germany a generation or two before the landing of the Plymouth pilgrims. The truth is, however, that, as much of our social wit is now credited to the ancient Greeks, something of our educational wisdom ought to be. Two centuries ago John Locke, as an able political writer, was invited to draw up a code of fundamental laws for the new colony of Carolina, and in like manner, more than 2,300 years ago, Charondas, a master of a similar type in Magna Græcia, was called to a similar task. This was to frame a series of statutes for the government of a Greek colony founded about 446 B. C., in the foot of Italy. This colony was Thurii, and conspicuous among the enactments of Charondas was the following:

"Charondas made a law unlike those of lawgivers before him, for he enacted that the sons of the citizens should all learn letters [or writing] (*ἅπαντας μανθάνειν γράμματα*), the city making payment to the teachers. He thought that the poor, not able to pay wages themselves, would otherwise fail of the best training. He counted writing the most important study, and with reason. Through writing, most things in life, and those the most useful, are accomplished—as ballots, epistles, laws, covenants. Who can sufficiently praise the learning of letters? Only through them are the dead held in memory by the living, through them those removed in place [as the colonists were planted beyond a sea which seemed to them world-wide] converse with those most distant in space as with by-standers. [See "Winter's Tale," I., 1, 33.] Again, in treaties among nations and kings the certainties of writing furnish the best pledge of persistent adhering to agreements. In fine, writing alone

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preserves the most brilliant utterances of wise men and the oracles of gods, nay philosophy and all culture. All these things it alone hands down to all future generations. Wherefore nature should be viewed as the source of life, but the source of living well we should consider the culture derived from writing. Inasmuch, then, as illiterates are deprived of a great good, Charondas came to their help, judging them worthy of public care and outlay. Former legislators had caused the sick to be attended by physicians at the public expense, thinking their bodies worthy of cure. He did more, for he cured souls afflicted with ignorance. The doctors of the body we pray that we may never need, while we would fain abide for ever with those who minister to the mind diseased."

—This extract is from the 'Bibliotheca Historica' of Diodorus Siculus (Book x, § 13), who was flourishing at the birth of Christ and was the most painstaking chronicler of the Augustan age. The legislation is worth notice for more than one reason. It rebukes the self-conceit of those who hold that the education of all at the charge of all is an idea born in our own time or country. It has also been strangely unnoticed by historians who ought to have kept it before the people. Thus, Charondas and his laws are spoken of by both Grote and Curtius, but this law is brought to view by neither of them. It is possible that Grote never heard of it, for he denies Charondas the credit of any legislative originality. Only in Weber ('Weltgeschichte,' vol. ii., p. 215) is this mother and model of a school law for the masses allowed a single line of mention, thus: "Alle Kinder sollen die vom Staat unterhaltenen Lese-schulen besuchen." Short as is this notice, it is not quite correct. The law of Charondas did not provide for the instruction of all children, but only for that of all *sons*. Sons is the word of Diodorus. Female education in common schools, this crowning key-stone in the arch of culture—this new thing under the sun—we may claim as a Yankee notion, pure and simple.

—A "trustworthy history of the city of New York" can be offered to the public without any apology, and it is earnestly to be hoped that such a work is to be found in the 'Memorial History,' edited by James Grant Wilson (New York History Co.), of which the first volume is now at hand. Many and important works have already appeared, purporting to be histories of the city, but they are for the most part merely elaborate and picturesque narratives of imposing events, and none of them seeks seriously to trace the causes or results of the incidents described. What book can claim to be a history in any true sense that devotes as many as fifty pages to the celebration of the opening of the Erie Canal, and not one to the social, economic, and political results of the event; that ignores entirely the changes by which in scarcely a decade the "nativist" constituency of the city was so transformed as to present a majority which was foreign by birth or extraction, and that omits even to record the first great political struggle to which this transformation gave rise; that fails almost entirely to notice the course of political events since 1857—the régime of Fernando Wood, the control of the city government from Albany established by Thurlow Weed through his State Commissions, the supremacy of Tweed and the beginning of the movement towards home rule through his charter, the reëstablishment of Tammany Hall (its organization and by-laws should be published everywhere to show that it is the most undemocratic political organization in the land), and the later struggles for simplicity and unity in the administration and for reform in the machinery of elections? In none of the many "histories" of New York are these matters considered. Two-thirds of every work hitherto published is devoted to the time before 1820, and of this most refers to the colonial period, when the city's population was only 20,000. But the New York of 20,000 inhabitants has little interest and little importance compared with New York the metropolis. The "history of New York" which will be welcome will deal fully, indeed, with the colonial as well as the later periods, but will particularly recognize that modern New York begins its existence about 1850, and that its growth since then deserves the most patient and laborious study and the most exhaustive treatment. In one of the best extant "histories" of the city—a work of 800 pages, recently published, and claiming to be complete to the year 1880—eight pages are deemed sufficient for the social and political development since 1857! It is to be hoped that the 'Memorial History' will fill the gap here indicated. The first volume is a satisfactory review of the seventeenth century, and if the quality of the work is maintained, there seems to be promise of a real history of the later times.

LOUNSBURY'S CHAUCER.—II.

Studies in Chaucer, his Life and Writings. By Thomas R. Lounsbury, Professor of English in the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University. 3 vols. Harper & Brothers. 1892.

"CHAUCER'S Relation to the Religion of his Time" is a very brilliant essay. The attempt to make the poet out a Wicliffite is first discussed, and its errors of fact and inference are exposed. Chaucer, Mr. Lounsbury insists, though he satirized the vices of the clergy, was in no sense a controversialist or a religious reformer: "he lived and moved in the dry light of the literary atmosphere, free from the passions that stirred the hearts of his contemporaries and the prejudices that warped their judgments." This is an extreme form of statement, and easily lends itself to misconstruction. Probably Mr. Lounsbury does not mean that Chaucer was not in every way a man of his age. If he had not been that, we should have had to do without the 'Canterbury Tales.' Dry light is *not* the best for some purposes. It is a foible of our self-satisfied time to think and to call such of the great of old as we condescend to admire "moderns"—that is, men intellectually and morally ripe enough for the enlightened present, though condemned by fate to pass their days in a century too young for them. This feeling shows itself, perhaps, in the sentence just quoted. It comes out still more clearly when Mr. Lounsbury passes from considering what Chaucer was not to a consideration of what he was. Chaucer's intellect, he tells us, was by nature sceptical; he was never spiritually minded, and, though he began his career with an honest, if not an enthusiastic, belief in the dogmas of the Church, he had become, long before the end of his life, something very like "a modern agnostic." "The general view of all his productions leaves upon the mind the impression that his personal religious history was marked by the dwindling devoutness of so many lives—the fallings from us, the vanishings, we know not how or when, of beliefs in which we have been bred." Now we are convinced that Chaucer was not a saint or a devotee. We are not concerned to prove him a good Catholic or even a good Christian. But we cannot think that Mr. Lounsbury has made out a case. His conclusion appears to us to rest in large part upon a misinterpretation of the spirit of the passages that he uses as evidence.

That Chaucer speaks of the Deity at times in a way that would nowadays be irreverent—as where he remarks, in exalting the beauty of Dido, that if God Himself wished for a mate, He could find no fairer lady—is a fact of no moment in this discussion. The moral Gower, whose devout orthodoxy may almost be termed notorious, does not hesitate, in emphasizing the impossibility of a niggard's succeeding in love, to assert that "with gift a man may undertake to please the high God." And in his enthusiasm over the reception of Jason in Colchis, he ventures upon a still more daring comparison:

> "Of him made every man a speche,
> Some man said on, some said an other;
> But *though he were goddes brother,*
> *And mighte make fire and thonder,*
> Ther mighte be no more wonder,
> Than was of him in that citee." (Ed. Pauli, ii., 255.)

Again, Mr. Lounsbury affirms that "the critical spirit is applied by Chaucer to the facts of the Bible as coolly as by the most cold-blooded of rationalists or the most scoffing of infidels." The only example cited in support of this rather strong statement is the attack made on Solomon by Proserpine in the 'Merchant's Tale.' The goddess calls Solomon "a lecher and an idolaster." These accusations, Mr. Lounsbury is forced to admit, are Bible truth; but he insists that the charge "would never have been so bluntly stated by a spiritually minded man." Surely at this point a demurrer may be interposed. The charge is not stated by a spiritually minded man; it is stated by a heathen goddess in the heat of an animated discussion with her Tartarean husband. However, it will be as well not to press this demurrer, for, if the context be scanned, Proserpine will be found appealing to her Bible in a fashion that makes this passage particularly unfit for Mr. Lounsbury's purpose. And, after all, was there any obligation on the most spiritually minded of men to treat Solomon's memory tenderly? Has Mr. Lounsbury forgotten that, in spite of Dante's doubts, the author of 'Piers Plowman' felt justified in associating the wisest of kings with the wisest of philosophers, and in proclaiming of Solomon and Aristotle: "al holi-cherche holdeth hem bothe ydampned"?

The two passages on which Mr. Lounsbury mainly relies, however, are the opening verses of the Prologue to the 'Legend of Good Women' and lines 1951-1958 of the 'Knight's Tale.' Both these passages are torn from the context, and ruthlessly compelled to give evidence without consulting their neighbors and friends. The result is startling. Boccaccio had devoted two or three stanzas to tracing the itinerary of Arcita's soul among the spheres. Chaucer had admired the description and had used it in the 'Troilus.' In the 'Knight's Tale,' therefore, written years afterward, he preferred not to employ the same rather frigid lines a second time. His taste had improved, and he accordingly inserted in the appropriate place a good-natured fling at the essential absurdity of the original—a fling which he enjoyed the more for being as much at himself as at Boccaccio. Out of this Mr. Lounsbury has extracted a confession of unfaith. "Can modern agnosticism," he asks, "point to a denial more emphatic . . . of the belief that there exists for us any assurance of the life that is lived beyond the grave?" The passage from the 'Legend,' which is used by Chaucer merely to introduce what he says of the authority of books, is thus summed up: "Chaucer [here]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indicates clearly his opinion that none have any real acquaintance with the nature of the future life of which they speak so confidently." Let us be preciser and say: "Chaucer indicates clearly his opinion that nobody whom he has ever seen has an *experimental knowledge* of the nature of the future life." An unexceptionable sentiment, for Chaucer's century or for our own! In all this we are not trying to establish Chaucer's belief in heaven and hell or in anything whatever. We are merely protesting against what seem to us inquisitorial methods. A poem is no more likely than a man to give trustworthy evidence under torture.

So eager is Mr. Lounsbury in pressing his point that he is ready to assert that Chaucer sometimes clothed his attacks on the Church in ambiguous language in order to avoid trouble. "It was doubtless essential to his comfort, if not to his safety, that his words could be taken in a double sense." So of the comments on the archdeacon's curse in the general Prologue. This will hardly do. It is humor, not prudence, that led Chaucer to "speak in amphibologies" on such occasions. Once more, Mr. Lounsbury declares that it is indicative of Chaucer's decline in faith in later life that he found "his keenest delight in the exposure of that dry-rot in religion when men no longer practise what they preach," etc. But Chaucer took no keener delight, to all seeming, in portraying the rascally pardoner or the hypocritical friar than in describing the good priest, the pious ploughman, or the unworldly clerk. The argument defeats itself. In the 'Wife's' Prologue Mr. Lounsbury discovers a "revolutionary document." This, with the host's raillery of the monk, is Chaucer's protest, he thinks, against the celibate ideal. "It was a triumph of literary art to put forward heterodox views prominently, and not subject himself to condemnation for their avowal." Here Mr. Lounsbury is unconsciously forsaking his hard-won ground. The purely literary man, resident in the dry light of belles-lettres, the non-controversialist, becomes of a sudden the social reformer—and that on the evidence of the Wife of Bath! The Prologue expresses the sentiments of that "worthy woman"; of so much we may be sure. To assume that it also expresses the sentiments of Chaucer is no more safe than to assume that the poet's marriage "was not a success," as Prof. Hales puts it, because the merchant satirizes wedlock. It is venturesome to select all the "modern" ideas uttered by any of the Canterbury pilgrims and to ascribe them to Chaucer, while we allow all those ideas that we think distinctly mediæval to remain the property of the speakers. Chaucer is a narrative poet, to be sure, as Mr. Lounsbury reminds us, but the conditions of his problem in the construction of the 'Canterbury Tales' demanded that he should be a dramatic artist as well.

The third volume of the 'Studies,' which many readers will find the most attractive of the work, consists of two long papers, "Chaucer in Literary History," and "Chaucer as a Literary Artist." In the first of these Mr. Lounsbury has undertaken a history of the reputation of Chaucer. His task was one of peculiar difficulty. It demanded not only learning and industry in the collection of materials scattered through the prose and verse of almost five hundred years, but nice discrimination in weighing testimony, a just and catholic spirit in estimating obsolete critical standards, and rare powers of selection, combination, and arrangement. The unquestioned supremacy of Chaucer in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the whimsically mistaken reverence paid him by the Puritan reformers of the sixteenth on the strength of a spurious work, his influence on Spenser and the Elizabethans, the decline of his fame and its revival through the vogue of Dryden's "Fables"—these are some of the subjects which Mr. Lounsbury has had to treat. In his account of the Chaucer "translations," from Dryden's to Horne's, he has put a neglected chapter of literary history into what may be deemed final shape. The curiously inconsistent effect of the modernizations in keeping the poet's name up while they prevented everybody from finding out anything about him at first hand, is clearly brought out. In illustrating the misapprehensions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when Chaucer's language was supposed to be hopelessly archaic, his verse harsh and often unmetrical, and his diction clumsy and obscure, Mr. Lounsbury has been obliged to characterize a series of attempted imitations of Chaucer, and here again he has supplied a considerable lacuna in the annals of letters. In a word, this whole paper is an appreciable contribution to knowledge. The author has so marshalled his facts and has chosen his illustrative quotations with such excellent judgment that the reader is never wearied or confused by their abundance. He has contrived to be methodical without being formal, and solidly instructive without deviating into dulness.

The concluding portion of the essay, however, we have read with many misgivings. It is a plea for modern spelling in our texts of Chaucer and for modern pronunciation in reading them. Special students, says Mr. Lounsbury, can always revert to editions in fourteenth-century orthography, and can indulge their fancy in efforts to reproduce fourteenth-century sounds; but for the general reader, and even for the man of letters, the spelling and the pronunciation of our own day will suffice. Only by this process of modernization can Chaucer become so well and widely known as he should be, and all pedantic predilections should give way to these considerations of utility. Fortunately, Mr. Lounsbury has tried to practise what he preaches, and has modernized the extracts from the poet which he has quoted in the course of his work. We say "fortunately," for, in our opinion, the attempt to read these extracts as thus printed will best counteract the influence which his utterances would otherwise exert. In the first place, the cutting off of final *-e* in rhyme quite misrepresents the melody and movement of Chaucer's verse. Further, since *-e* and *-en* have to be preserved in the interior of the line, the reader will not fail to notice that the resultant forms are often neither of the fourteenth century nor of the present time. Again, many words that look familiar when spelled in modern fashion, lose that air when it is discovered that they cannot be accented in modern fashion without destroying the measure. In a word, that absence of strangeness which it is Mr. Lounsbury's aim to effect, is seen to be attained in no appreciable degree. Modern spelling and modern pronunciation will not make Chaucer's words familiar in look and in sound unless we fall back to the practice of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and disregard the metre. But this is not all. The student who tries to read Mr. Lounsbury's modernized quotations will find himself in a curious dilemma. *Anon* and *stone*, *shall* and *all*, *case* and *was*, *shoe* and *in principio* will not rhyme. What is the reader to do? Shall he content himself with imperfect rhymes? He is mangling the verses of the most melodious of poets. Shall he accommodate the pronunciation of *shall* to that of *all*, the pronunciation of *was* to that of *case*? He is abandoning the principle of modernization. With this dilemma the subject may be left. We regret that Mr. Lounsbury has lent the weight of his authority to pervert many who, but for him, might have made a shift to acquire some system of pronunciation which, though perhaps philologically imperfect, would at least reasonably well satisfy the requirements of practice.

The second part of this volume is in a manner complementary to "The Chaucer Legend," for a good portion of it is devoted to exploding critical fatuities. Literary critics have always been exasperatingly irresponsible; and small blame to them, for none of them has ever promulgated an absurdity so monstrous as not to be hailed by his disciples as a proof of "insight." But there are indications to-day that criticism is very specially anxious to emancipate itself from accountability. The old magisterial way of valuing an author according as he did or did not conform to certain arbitrary rules supposed to have been laid down by the ancients for their own guidance, was bad enough; but the new fashion of pretending that you are an initiate in some mysterious thought free-masonry by means of which your author speaks to you directly, heart to heart, in a language which you will do your best to translate to the world, but of whose grammar and vocabulary you can give no account, is downright pernicious, however interesting as a sign of the marked tendency of this age to dabble in occult sciences. Peculiarly irritating is this sort of criticism when it rests on tradition after all—when the critic is detected translating into what he calls human speech, *not* the results of some esoteric communion with the astral spirit of his author, but the results of inherited misapprehension and ignorance.

No great poet has suffered more from the incompetency of his critics than Chaucer, and therefore much that still passes current as opinion about him is pitifully out of the way. Mr. Lounsbury's paper is, then, a welcome contribution to Chaucer literature. The masculine qualities of style and judgment which he has evinced in dealing with other departments of his subject are equally evident here. The belief that Chaucer was an inspired barbarian, who sang, without art, what the gods put into his head, is perhaps not entertained by anybody at the present time in quite so gross a form as that in which it prevailed a hundred and fifty years ago; but various ludicrous notions founded on that belief are still cherished here and there. We may well be grateful, therefore, to Mr. Lounsbury for demonstrating that Chaucer was his own severest critic, and that his constant progress in literary and poetic art was not made unconsciously. In dwelling on this side of Chaucer's nature Mr. Lounsbury has, perhaps, failed to emphasize sufficiently that spontaneity which was an equally striking characteristic of his genius. But this is a slight defect at most. The chapter is very able throughout—clearly and cogently written, and not above giving reasons for the faith that is in it. It is not only a lesson in Chaucer, but a lesson in conscientious and sensible criticism—the admirable ending of an admirable book.

With 1900, the 500th year of Chaucer's posthumous fame will be finished. Many scholars are busy studying the poet, and much has been accomplished; but heretofore the results arrived at have been mainly tentative; and, even when sound conclusions have been reached, they have usually been put forth in forms laying small claim to permanence. Hence the hopeful ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pectancy with which we wait for Mr. Skeat's promised edition of the 'Canterbury Tales'; and hence, too, our satisfaction in the thorough, scholarly, and in many respects final 'Studies' of Mr. Lounsbury, which will go far to enable American learning to face the coming anniversary without shame.

LORD ROSEBERY'S PITT.

Pitt. By Lord Rosebery. New York: Macmillan & Co.

THERE is probably still in England, as there was in the days of Horace Walpole, a decorous predilection for royal and noble authors. A more reasonable interest is felt in a life of a statesman written by one who himself aspires to that part. Lord Rosebery has perhaps had the benefit of both these sentiments. His work, however, if not masterly, is thoroughly clever. It shows, as might be expected, parliamentary experience and familiarity with political and diplomatic history. It is lively and sometimes trenchant in style, and nowhere smells of the House of Lords.

Lord Rosebery does not note the European significance of Pitt's figure as one of that group of reformers before the French Revolution upon which history looks back with a wistful eye. Seen from this point of view, Pitt is the companion of Frederick the Great, Joseph II., Catherine of Russia, Leopold of Tuscany, Pombal, Aranda, Tanucci, and Turgot. All these sovereigns and ministers, imbued more or less with the philosophy of the eighteenth century, had in their various ways and different degrees been ushering in a policy of enlightenment, beneficence, and toleration. They had as their fellow-workers philanthropists like Howard and Wilberforce, as well as economists like Adam Smith, whose follower Pitt was proud to be. The immense influence of Voltaire, whether entirely wholesome or not, and the homage paid to him and other leaders of literature by crowned heads, showed that intellect was gaining ascendancy over force. A happy change was coming by a quiet process over the general spirit of government and legislation. War itself seemed to be gradually wearing out, and on the eve of the Revolution Pitt looked forward to a long reign of peace, and to such a reduction of taxation as would have enabled him to abolish customs duties and thereby probably to open an era of free trade to mankind. Why could not destiny continue to hold that course? Was it inevitable that the work of peaceful improvement should be wrecked by a sudden eruption of revolutionary violence in France; that a reign of terror should ensue, staining the course of progress with unutterable crimes; that this should be followed by the military rule of a Corsican marauder of mighty genius trampling the civilization to which he was an alien beneath the feet of his devastating hosts, and bequeathing to the succeeding generations the legacy of a revived militarism, while the Reign of Terror bequeathed its Jacobin madness? Such is the question pensively asked by those who care more for the character than the name of government, and desire reform and improvement, not destruction and convulsion. In the disappointing 'Memoirs' of Talleyrand there is sometimes a memorable word; and there is no word more memorable or more profound than his saying that the main cause of the French Revolution was vanity. No Roman Talleyrand could have said this of Christianity; nor was a movement of which the mainspring was vanity, likely to end in the regeneration of the world.

Heredity may be a principle well established in its application to horses and dogs, but it is still precarious in its application to human genius. Chatham's eldest son was to all outward appearances a mediocrity and a total failure, both in the Senate and in the field, though Lord Rosebery thinks he has discovered in him a talent for counsel. His second son was illustrious in the very opposite way to his father. Chatham was a great war minister, but no financier or general administrator; his son was a first-rate financier and general administrator, but as a war minister a noted failure. Both were eloquent, but the eloquence of the son was as passionless as that of the father was impassioned. To the nation, however, Pitt was the son of Chatham, and its heart yearned towards him when it was wearied by the long reign of aristocratic cabal, selfish jobbery, and ill-starred war.

Pitt was beyond doubt the choice of the nation, which, as soon as an appeal was made to it, ratified, by an overwhelming vote, his accession to its leadership in place of the justly detested coalition. The consciousness that the tide was rising rapidly in his favor, and that he had only to hold on till the Parliament could be dissolved, must have made his struggle against the coalition majority much easier and less miraculous than it seems. But it will not do to accept without comment, as Lord Rosebery does, the transaction through which Pitt was made Prime Minister. The King's conduct was utterly indefensible. He had a right to dismiss the coalition Ministry, call Pitt or any one else he chose to his councils, and appeal to the country for ratification, facing the risk of having to take back his old Ministers at a sacrifice of power and dignity in case of his defeat. But he had no right to conspire against his constitutional advisers, and this was what he did. If the King's intervention to induce the Lords to throw out Fox's India Bill was constitutional, why did not Temple deliver his message openly from his place in the House of Lords? Why did he resort to the circulation of a clandestine card? This seems a conclusive answer to all apologies for the King's act. Temple was an intriguer of the most sinister kind. Pitt cannot escape blame for accepting the Premiership at the hands of perfidy and intrigue, though the blame will be softened by his youth and by the self-restraint, if not self-denial, which he had before displayed. Breaches of constitutional right are most dangerous when masked, as in this case, by personal or extraneous considerations, such as the righteous feeling of the country against the coalition. Nor could Pitt's own position in relation to the King fail to be weakened by the consciousness that he owed his place to royal trickery. "Wrong never comes right," was the favorite saying of Theodore Hook. Wrong did not come right even here, though the King, where he sought a tool, found a master.

Nothing could be happier or brighter than the early days of the young Minister's reign, while he was carrying into effect the lessons of Adam Smith, raising the revenue by a reduction of duties, cleansing the Augean stable of oligarchic abuse, and reforming all parts of the administration. Slight and transient was the shadow cast by his comparative weakness in the management of foreign affairs. During this period he was, as Lord Rosebery says, the man of the people, that is, of the middle and trading class, beyond which political life did not then descend. He was what would now be called a Liberal as opposed to a Radical. A Whig he styled himself to the end of his life. If he let Parliamentary reform gradually drop, he might partly excuse himself by saying that he found practical improvement on the largest scale possible without constitutional change. In this, however, he was probably swayed by his relation to the King.

The French Revolution brought a complete and tragic change. Lord Rosebery is right in saying that Pitt did not wish to interfere. He held out against intervention as long as he could. He was, as Lord Rosebery says, the most strenuous of peace Ministers. After all it was by the French that war was declared, though England perhaps had taken the decisive step in dismissing the French Ambassador on the execution of the King. It was not easy, in truth, even for the least meddlesome of Ministers to keep the peace with the nation which threatened all existing governments with subversion by its propagandism, and claimed, as in the Scheldt case, the liberty of setting aside all treaties and the public law of Europe if they conflicted with principles of natural right, of which it held itself the judge. Fair allowance must also be made for the horror and indignation excited in all breasts which revolutionary fanaticism had not steeled against natural sentiment, by the crimes of the Jacobins, their rabid blasphemies, and the cruel murder of the King and Queen. Fox, also, by his unmeasured language, made it more difficult for Pitt to stand against the tide of anti-Jacobin feeling. How Lord Rosebery can compare Fox to Luther it is difficult to understand. Fox was a great orator as Luther was a great preacher, and the temperaments of both were warm and generous; other likeness we fail to see. The character of Fox was largely formed at the gambling-table and in the drinking-bout. He came out first as a violent Tory. Then he became an equally violent Whig, and by his ostentatious sympathy with the rebellion at the time of the American war helped to drive the Tories to extremes. Next he combined with the Tory North, between whom and himself he had put, as far as the most solemn words could do it, an impassable barrier of honor. His coalition having been overthrown by public indignation, he again became a Whig, and at the crisis of the French Revolution, when he ought to have done his utmost to calm British feeling by moderate language and by disclaiming sympathy with violence or sedition, he did his utmost to inflame it by boundless laudation of the revolutionists and palliation of their crimes. A man might have generous sympathies, a winning character, and great powers in debate without being wise or even very conscientious. Lord Rosebery excuses Fox's opposition to Pitt's beneficent commercial policy on the ground that he knew nothing of political economy. Was not a man bound to know something of political economy when he took it upon him to lead a commercial nation?

Once swept away by the tide, Pitt seems to have shared the panic. His wild language, once more quoted by Lord Rosebery, can scarcely admit any other interpretation. He must be severely blamed for prolonging the war on the ground that in his opinion the French Government was not sufficiently stable and trustworthy to make peace, and for allowing his Foreign Minister, Lord Granville, to intimate that England desired as a condition previous to treating with France the restoration of the Bourbons. Had not the monarchies of France and Spain been content to treat with the regicide usurper Cromwell? It seems not to have dawned upon Pitt's mind that Napoleon had mastered the Revolution, and that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thenceforth, if anything was to be feared, it was not revolutionary propagandism, but military ambition. Nor can we, with Lord Rosebery, justify Pitt in resorting to coercion, even though he had Parliament on his side. The people of England generally were content with their modicum of liberty. The number of those who sympathized with the Revolution, or even agitated for constitutional change, the great alarmist Burke being witness, was contemptibly small. The mob at Birmingham was on the side of the Government. Coercion called into existence that hostility to Government which it was intended to repress. Lord Rosebery says that the State trials "cleared the air." At the time it was alleged that, in spite of the failure to obtain convictions, the trials had done good by revealing the abyss to the country. But courts of justice cannot be properly used for the purpose of clearing the air or revealing the abyss: they can be properly used only for the purpose of justice; and a Government which puts them to any other use commits at once a crime and a blunder. Carlyle calls Pitt "a lean, inflexible man." Lean he was, but it may be doubted whether he was inflexible. His habit of keeping people at a distance was rather a sign that he feared influence. He was greatly swayed by Dundas, a man far inferior to him in everything but the lowest kinds of statecraft, as his otherwise inexplicable change of front in the case of Hastings showed; and we can hardly doubt that he was hurried by the tide of anti-Revolutionary sentiment at court and among the upper classes into excesses of coercion which, left to himself, he would have disapproved. The weakness of his health, aggravated by a bad regimen, of which port wine was the principal article, can hardly have helped to brace his moral sinew or make his political attitude firm.

Lord Rosebery defends Pitt's war administration against Macaulay. Macaulay always overstates his case; but here surely he is not very far wrong. Lord Rosebery sets the success at sea against the failures on land. It would have been difficult to prevent the British navy from showing its qualities; but Pitt did not, like his father, inspire its victories. He cannot be said to have brought forward Nelson. He seems never to have looked into the condition of the seamen, and he left their abominable grievances unredressed till attention was enforced by the mutiny at the Nore. On land he was unlucky, no doubt, in having a Napoleon for his foe; but it was not Napoleon who put the Duke of York at the head of a British army. Pitt had not a spark of magnetism, nor did his eye discern the genius of any Wolfe. His forces were never found on a decisive field. He spent himself, as his biographer admits, in scattered and isolated efforts, costly both in money and life, and in which, before the Peace of Amiens, were sacrificed no less than 1,350 officers and 30,000 men. "But our fleet," says Lord Rosebery, "swept the seas and swept all hostile colonies into our net." Meantime Europe was being swept into the net of France. Against Pitt's war finance, it seems, there is nothing to be said except that the suspension of cash payments, like every resort to a forced paper currency, or tampering with the currency of any kind, was sure to be found ruinously expensive as well as demoralizing in the long run.

In treating of the Union with Ireland, and the Irish question generally, the biographer is evidently embarrassed by his own political position, and we are left in doubt as to his real view of the Union. He does full justice, however, to Pitt's upright intention. He sees that the recall of the Liberal Viceroy, Fitzwilliam, about which so much invective and lamentation have been poured forth, was due to the indiscretion of Fitzwilliam himself, and his departure from instructions which bound him to proceed with the requisite caution in the inauguration of his new system. Pitt no doubt sincerely deplored the necessity. He had always been in favor of toleration and of justice to Ireland. He had given Canada a measure of Catholic emancipation, and he had been prevented from extending to Ireland the full benefit of his commercial policy only by a coalition of Irish jealousy with the greed of English monopolists, and with the virulence of political factions headed, to their discredit, by Fox and Burke. His object in carrying the Union was beyond doubt to put an end to the tyranny of Protestant ascendancy, to the murderous strife of factions in Ireland, and to government by corruption, at the same time consolidating the kingdom and securing it against invasion. Lord Rosebery takes it for granted that the Union was carried by corruption which he calls "horrible and wholesale," but which he somewhat cynically defends as the established system. He seems not to know that it has been proved that the supposed bribes were, in fact, compensations regularly assigned under an act of Parliament to the proprietors of nomination boroughs in Ireland, in accordance with the notions of an age which regarded such boroughs as property, and paid without distinction to those who had voted against the Union as well as to those who had voted for it. Pitt would never have been a party to pecuniary corruption. Peerages no doubt he lavished without stint; of these he was always scornfully prodigal, partly, as Lord Rosebery thinks, because he liked to swamp the old Whig houses. In criticising the means by which the Union was carried, people are apt to forget the tremendous motive afforded to all who cared for their property or their lives by the events of '98. Nor was Pitt guilty of any breach of good faith towards the Roman Catholics. He had given no pledge, but he did his best to carry Catholic emancipation. He was foiled by the treachery of Loughborough and the self-interest, which disguised itself as bigotry, of ecclesiastics playing on the crazy scruples of the King. He then resigned. What more could he have done? To pass the measure over the King's veto was impossible, and it would have been not only foolish but criminal on the part of Pitt to attempt to carry his point by throwing the Government into convulsions at the most dangerous crisis of a great war. His resumption of power without authority to deal with the Catholic question is equally capable of defence. The nation had no other man to lead it, and was it to be conquered by Napoleon rather than that a measure of domestic reform should be postponed? Mr. Lecky is strangely unjust to Pitt on this occasion. Lord Rosebery does him justice. Such charges as that of premeditated treachery to the Roman Catholics, or that of concerting a destruction of documents to conceal criminal practices in carrying the Union, could have been made only by faction in its most malignant frenzy, and Lord Rosebery properly passes them over in silence.

Sparkling sentences not a few might be culled from this book. In defending Pitt's omission to patronize literature, Lord Rosebery says that "more Miltons have remained mute and inglorious under the suffocation of wealth than under the frosts of poverty," and that "the best literature has been produced by duns." This is epigram, not history; but it has in it perhaps as much of historic truth as epigram requires. Pitt's elder brother, the bearer of the family title, was once likely to die. "Lord Chatham's death," remarks Lord Rosebery, "by the grim humor of our Constitution, would have removed Pitt from the Commons to the Peers. . . . It would have been as if the Duke of Wellington, in the middle of the Peninsular war, had been transferred by the operation of constitutional law to the government of Chelsea Hospital." Here Lord Rosebery has in his mind, no doubt, the case of Lord Hartington and, perhaps, his own. That "an ex-Premier in a Cabinet as an ordinary member is a fleeting and dangerous luxury" is an apothegm which at once raises in the mind of the British reader the image of Lord Russell in the Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen. Perhaps the smartest hit is at Addington, who is said to have "carried into politics the indefinable air of a village apothecary inspecting the tongue of the State." Addington, it will be remembered, was the son of a physician, and was himself nicknamed "The Doctor." If he were alive, he would be totally incapable of avenging himself on Lord Rosebery by an epigram; but perhaps he might have said that even extreme cleverness is not always a sure earnest of greatness as a statesman.

BOOKS ON ART.

The Early Renaissance, and Other Essays on Art Subjects. By James M. Hoppin, Professor of the History of Art in Yale University. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892.

The Human Figure: Its Beauties and Defects. By Ernst Brücke, Emeritus Professor of Physiology in the University of Vienna and formerly Teacher of Anatomy in the Academy of Fine Arts at Berlin. With a Preface by William Anderson, Professor of Anatomy to the Royal Academy of Arts, London, and Lecturer on Anatomy at St. Thomas's Hospital. Authorized translation, revised by the author. With 29 illustrations by Hermann Parr. London: H. Grevel & Co.; New York: B. Westermann & Co. 1891.

Lessons on Decorative Design. By Frank G. Jackson, Second Master, Birmingham Municipal School of Art. Third Thousand. London: Chapman & Hall; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891.

Nature in Ornament. By Lewis F. Day, author of 'Every-day Art.' With 123 plates and 192 illustrations in the text. London: B. T. Batsford; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

English Pen Artists of To-day: Examples of their Work, with some Criticisms and Appreciations. By Charles G. Harper. Macmillan & Co. 1892.

Les Artistes Célèbres. Antoine Watteau. Par G. Dargenty. 1891. *Abraham Bosse.* Par Antony Valabrègue. 1892. Paris: Librairie de l'Art; New York: Macmillan & Co.

One of Prof. Hoppin's essays is on the subject of "Art in Education," and in it he discusses many questions concerning the teaching of art in connection with university education, such as: "How far shall the study of Art enter into a regular academic course? How can it find a place without displacing more important studies? Should it constitute a purely professional school by itself, rather than an academical course of study?" etc., etc. A much more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important question, which he does not discuss, but which is inevitably suggested by a reading of his book, is: Who shall be the teachers of art? When we find a Professor of the History of Art at Yale College devoting an essay to wire-drawn criticism and extravagant laudation of the antique Niobe group, the "interest" of which he thinks "is more the subject of human thought and sympathy than even" the Parthenon figures; when he calls Murillo "an exemplification of all the richest and best qualities of Spanish painting," and finds that master of namby-pamby "appealing to the deepest heart of true worshippers in all ages and nations"; when he ranks Alma-Tadema, Leighton, and Turner among the Pre-Raphaelites, and Millet among the Impressionists, and calls Bastien Le Page "a disciple of Millet but especially of Cazin," then one longs for the words of one artist who has some real knowledge of his subject. And could the most inarticulate of painters express himself less clearly than Mr. Hoppin does in such a sentence as this?

"The atmosphere of his [Claude's] pictures, their aerial perspectives which carry the eye and mind into the illimitable, the coloring not always serene but sometimes sombre with deeper tints, the tender gradations of light and shade,—of evening and morn and fiery noon,—the breadth of composition, and, above all, the exquisite finish that makes even Turner's pictures that hang defiantly by the side of the Claudes in the National Gallery of London, look a bit imperfect, muddy, and dull-brown,—these cannot lose their charm under the most advanced criticism; but that they are the highest conceptions of Nature in her real beauty, significance, and force, with clouds as they are in the sky floating lightly in space and bearing the thunder in them, of nature varied with dull scenes, with striking contrasts and grim ugliness in which also there is power, Claude gives us little."

This is so wonderful—style, grammar, punctuation, and all—that we have not the heart to cut it short. And yet Prof. Hoppin wishes to teach art in the university on account of its influence in forming a "clear, vigorous, and elegant style of writing."

Prof. Brücke's little treatise is a very German book indeed. It is an attempt, by study, first of the antique and afterwards of nature, to fix a standard of what artists shall be allowed to find beautiful in the human figure. In the latter part of the book some concessions are made to individual taste, but in the first chapter, on the head, the Greek fetish is supreme, and Greek noses and Greek mouths are the only ones allowed as worthy of reproduction in serious art. One of the notable things about the unreasoning worship of the Greeks by so many critics is, that it is always to the second-rate, conventional Greek work that they attach themselves most firmly, and that they seem almost unaware of the existence of the great figures from the Parthenon. In discussing, for instance, the purely conventional representation of the iliac line which obtained in archaic and later Greek sculpture, Prof. Brücke makes no mention of the fact that in one of the most superb of antique figures, the Ilissus, this line is treated in a purely naturalistic manner. When will the art-critics learn that because a statue is antique it is not necessarily good, and that the conventions of second-rate Greek sculptors are no more binding on the modern artist than they were on the really great Greeks? When will they learn that art is not necessarily the more ideal for being less natural, and that the greatest idealists have been the greatest realists too? Also, that there is more than one kind of beauty, and that the artist's business is to reproduce that which seems beautiful to him?

That Mr. Jackson's volume, which was reviewed in these columns upon its first appearance, should have reached its "third thousand" may be an encouraging sign of the amount of interest in decorative design that today exists; but, if there were nothing better than this for that interest to feed on, the outlook would not be altogether agreeable. Fortunately, in Mr. Day's 'Nature in Ornament' (one of a series of "Text-books of Ornamental Design" by the same author) we have something very much better indeed. Mr. Day is a practical designer, the merit of whose work predisposes one to accept his opinions, and his opinions are broad and catholic and clearly stated. The numerous illustrations are well selected and admirably rendered. His book is one to be thankful for.

Mr. Harper's book is a sort of supplement to Mr. Pennell's 'Pen-Drawing.' Mr. Harper conceives that Mr. Pennell has done scant justice to the English pen-draughtsmen, and has therefore devoted an entire volume, got up in the same lavish style, to them alone. We cannot say that he is justified by the result. The men not represented in Mr. Pennell's volume will, with few exceptions, hardly add to the reputation of English pen-drawing, while those represented in both books are quite as well shown in Mr. Pennell's. In at least one case Mr. Harper has reproduced the identical drawing which had already served Mr. Pennell. Mr. Harper's arrangement is careless and his style slovenly, while his rabid dislike of everything American (except American printing, which he admits is better than English) is amusing. So, also, is his contention that the pen-draughtsmen are the only men who can draw, and that the painters can only color. One may heartily admire good pen-drawing without being ready to admit that it is the highest of all graphic arts. Mr. Harper's protests against plagiarism may do good, but they would be more likely to do so if nearly all the sin were not laid upon American shoulders, and if he showed any appreciation of the existence of such straightforward and original draughtsmen as Abbey and Eaton and other Americans.

The two little monographs on Watteau and Abraham Bosse, reproductions from *L'Art*, are in the characteristic careful and appreciative French manner. They are profusely illustrated and accompanied with bibliographies and other aids. Watteau is justly placed among "celebrated artists." It is only comparatively of late that his charming genius has begun to be appreciated, and only within a few years that his "Embarquement pour l'île de Cythère" has been given its rightful place in the Salon Carré of the Louvre. As to Bosse, his interest is mainly that of an illustrator of the costumes and customs of the seventeenth century, but there is a certain grave charm in some of his compositions in spite of their severity and rigidity.

Lectures on the History of Literature. Delivered by Thomas Carlyle, April to July, 1838. Edited, with preface and notes, by Professor J. Reay Greene. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. 1892.

THIS volume is made from a manuscript copy of the notes of Carlyle's lectures in the spring of 1838, taken down by Mr. Thomas Chisholm Anstey, a barrister-at-law and member of Parliament. They bear in their style abundant evidence of fidelity, and give a useful impression of Carlyle as a popular lecturer. The subject, which is the entire field of literature, is a broad one, and its main topics could only be touched upon. The substance of the volume is of no great consequence, either critically or as an addition to Carlyle's works. The parts of the general subject which specially interested him or had received thorough study from him, have been handled with more completeness and vastly more vigor in his published works, such as 'Heroes and Hero Worship' and the 'Critical Miscellanies.' Whoever wishes to know what he saw in Dante, Luther, or Knox may look in these other volumes with more profit than would be derived from a perusal of this. The omissions, if one looks on this as a history of the world's literature, are many and grave; there is nothing notable in the method; in fact, considered merely by itself, the work is weak. The moralizing which pervades the whole, the counsel to action, the praise of unconsciousness and silence, the gospel of the divine right of great men—all this is familiar matter and does not gain by the dilution it has suffered.

The principal value of the book is biographical in the sense that it affords a bird's-eye view, doubtless tolerably fair and complete, of Carlyle's culture in the strict humane sense—a ground-plan, so to speak, of his knowledge of the world's history and books; and at the same time renders his impressions with regard to the course of civilization. The defects of his mind and the narrowness of its horizons are more felt than the strength and originality of his genius. His overmastering subservience intellectually to German thought and to German literary fashions is made especially conspicuous, and suggests again what has long been a cause of wonder to us, why none of the thousand essayists upon Carlyle has endeavored to make out clearly just how much in his theory of life and character was derived from German sources, and particularly Goethe, and how much what he received was modified by his personality. His genius appears to us to have been not that of the original thinker, but one simply of expression on the literary side and of plodding industry on the scholarly side. He took his main ideas from others and worked them up and gave them individuality by a peculiar faculty he had for originality of presentation; and, further than this, he spent years in furnishing illustrations of these ideas from history and biography. He had, to help him, also a power of imagination rather pictorial than penetrative, with an abnormal and distorting tendency to the grotesque; and this told in his handling of anything he took up. He was never strong as a thinker, but gains his impressiveness from other and, in the main, literary qualities; and when stripped, as he is in this volume, of the advantages of his intense and violent style, and reduced to the plain elements of what he said, he does not strike the reader for substance. He is continually making the object of his admiration, whether an idea or a person, loom larger by surrounding it with a kind of fog; he adopts a superior manner, as if he spoke with an elongated finger pointing at the auditor; and in these pages the mode of the thing is too transparent. On the whole, it does not seem to us the present publication is the work of a friend. Whether as history or as criticism, it would hardly pass muster on its merits, at the present time, even on the platform; and as an addition to the many volumes of a great writer it is absurdly below the level of his performance.

An Introduction to the Theory of Value: on the Lines of Menger, Wieser, and Böhm-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bawerk. By William Smart, M.A. Macmillan & Co.

THE work of the Austrian economists is of very considerable importance. Following the line marked out by Jevons, they have analyzed with great subtlety the psychological aspects of economic phenomena, and have reached conclusions that are, to say the least, instructive. From a certain point of view their position is inexpugnable. It cannot be denied that the final cause of all industry is the satisfaction of human desire. It seems to follow that any material object will be sought, or prized, or valued, simply as a means to the satisfaction of desire. It follows conversely that if it ceases to satisfy desire, it must cease to be valued, and here comes in the great principle of "final" or "marginal" utility. We distinguish wants according to their urgency; in other words, if we cannot satisfy them all, we satisfy some in preference to others. The material object that satisfied the relinquished desire may be said, therefore, to have had a "marginal" utility, or, in Mr. Smart's language, "the value of a good is measured by the importance of that concrete want which is least urgent among the wants satisfied." The most important corollary from this principle is, that if a given quantity of a thing satisfies all desire for that thing, an additional quantity of the thing can have no value, as it satisfies no desire. The qualification should be added, that some new desire may arise which may be satisfied by the additional product, and therefore give it value. But the truth that is of importance is, that value is not an attribute of things, but an accident, depending upon the nature and extent of the wants of men.

We think it obvious that in venturing into that Serbonian bog of economists, the subject of supply and demand, the study of the psychology of desire may be of much assistance. The greatest minds that have dealt with economics have come to grief in their endeavors to coördinate such elements as a state of consciousness and a material quantity, and it can be only gradually that problems requiring a comprehension of metaphysics will be fully understood, much less solved, by most political economists. Moreover, it has always been held that the science is to a great extent, at least, deduced from some psychological laws, and whatever tends to define more clearly the scope of these laws will be a legitimate contribution to the science. But it is quite possible to take a partial view of the matter, and to exaggerate the importance of psychological distinctions. Something, perhaps, may be learned from the history of the free-will controversy. It was asserted by some determinists that the will was always moved by the strongest motive—an assertion which was after a time seen to reduce to the barren proposition that the will was always moved by the motive that moved it. There is, in our opinion, some ground for maintaining that the proposition that value is measured by the importance of the least urgent want is not much more fruitful. Without a scale of wants arranged according to their importance—a permanent hedonic calculus—we are as far away as ever from measuring values.

Something further may be learned from the history of metaphysical controversy. The term cause is notoriously ambiguous, and though no term is more commonly used, there has never been any general agreement as to its definition. Granting that satisfaction of desire is the final cause of human industry, it is to be remembered that there are other than final causes. According to Mill, the cause of a phenomenon is the antecedent, or the concurrence of antecedents, on which it is invariably and unconditionally consequent. It is obvious that on this theory satisfaction of desire is insufficient as a definition of the cause of value. It is a highly generalized and abstract term, and as a statement of the motive of action it is open to the well-known criticism—"When a horse is hungry, what he desires is not happiness, but hay." We have to reckon with Aristotle's τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τό τι ἦν εἶναι. If it is true that our desire for a thing gives it its value, is it not true that the essential attributes of the thing are the cause of our desiring it?

While there is some exhilaration to be derived from this metaphysical waltzing, it is doubtful if it results in much real progress. Admitting the psychological basis of economics, it is yet for practical purposes better to regard it not as a department of psychology, but as a science concerned with things. Moreover, it is futile to speculate upon the degrees of value assigned each of five sacks of grain by a Robinson Crusoe. We cannot assume that what one man desires will be desired in the same degree by others, nor can we strike an average without committing the fallacy of composition. For scientific purposes we must take things as they are, all the world being a market, and the inhabitants thereof buyers and sellers. As Mill said, it is prices in a wholesale market that we have to confine ourselves to, and this implies that every purchase is made with a view to exchange. If we speak of human desire, it must be human desire in the guise of commodities or services, set off against other commodities or services. In short, we must measure desire for things by measuring the things and not the desire; for we have no available psychological standard. If we are asked, "Can a thing have any value if no one wants it?" we must reply, No; but when we say no one wants it, we mean that no one will give any other thing for it, and if any one will give anything for it, that thing is the measure of its value. With some of Sidgwick's qualifications, Mill's classification of values seems to be still the most serviceable.

Mr. Smart is not at all immoderate in his claims. He admits that in the case of goods reproducible at will the cost of production determines the value. But this, he says, is only a convenient expression of a deeper law. On the old theory the value of a good comes from its past, whereas the causal connection runs the other way, from product to cost. "Value comes, not from the past of goods, but from their future; that is to say, from the side of consumption in satisfying want. Goods stand midway between production and consumption. In the old reading it was the former term that gave value; in the new it is the latter." So far as this refers to quantity of consumption, it emphasizes an important truth. If a man proposes to engage in the manufacture of a particular commodity, he will do well to inform himself not only as to the cost of production, but also as to the quantity consumed, although as a matter of fact most men probably content themselves with ascertaining simply cost and market price. Undoubtedly sagacious men may divine the possibility of new wants and seek to satisfy such variations in existing wants as they foresee. But the great body of industrial achievement has always consisted in diminishing the cost of production, and the practical worth of the science of political economy is closely connected with its recognition of this fact. Nevertheless, we must admit that in numberless ways the study of the desires of mankind is suggestive, and on that account we are grateful to the Austrian economists for their labors. Mr. Smart's little book is welcome because it summarizes a portion of their results in a manner convenient for English readers. He has already translated two of Böhm-Bawerk's works, and he informs us that one of his pupils is now preparing a translation of Wieser's application of the theory of value to distribution. To these works this manual will be for many persons a useful introduction.

On the Dedications of American Churches. Compiled by Two Laymen of the Diocese of Rhode Island. Cambridge: Printed at the Riverside Press. 1891.

THE purpose of this handsome monograph is stated with an approach to completeness in its sub-title: "An Enquiry into the Naming of Churches in the United States, some Account of English Dedications, and Suggestions for future Dedications in the American Church." Its compilers, as they modestly call themselves, express a certain sensitiveness to what they deem the imperfections of their work, and a regret that the conditions under which it has been done have made an adequate treatment of their subject impossible. We do not think that their readers will share these feelings. The authors write for the benefit of their fellow-Churchmen of the Episcopal communion, and a great many of these must have felt the barrenness and monotony of the nomenclature of their churches, and be ready to welcome such information and suggestions as are here offered to them. The poverty of the name-list of Episcopal churches is really astonishing. Here and there American invention—or is it American humor?—breaks out in some such effort of misdirected ingenuity as appears in the name of "The Church of the Heavenly Rest," which is probably the oddest invocation ever devised for a building meant for the use of a portion of the Church Militant. But for the most part the virtuous namers of churches walk a narrow round. In one diocese, for instance, four dedications only are made to serve for eighty-two churches: St. Paul, for sixteen; St. John, seventeen; Trinity, twenty-four; Christ, twenty-five. In another, there are ninety-four churches under four dedications—St. John, twenty-two; Grace, twenty-three; St. Paul, twenty-three; Christ, twenty-six. English, and especially Welsh dedications, have a much wider scope, as may be seen from an analysis of 18,500 of them which our compilers give. The number of different names that appear in this must run well up into the hundreds: the list occupies more than twenty-six pages. Besides its analysis, there is a large finding-table of American dedications, a chapter of good suggestions as to dedications to be made hereafter, and various appendices and notes that convey pleasantly much valuable information not easily to be had elsewhere. Amusement also may be found in some of the quaint and puzzling shapes into which the names of certain of the saints of old time have been transformed. Hippolytus appears as 'Eppalets,' which suggests irresistibly a dedication for a West Point chapel; and Olave becomes 'Tooley,' a sad come-down for the king of whom Adam of St. Victor wrote:

"Rex Olave, qui regium
Nomen habes egregium
Unctionis."

A word may be added as to the rather exceptional typographical beauty of the volume, which recalls, perhaps with some advantages, certain fine liturgiological books published by Pickering forty years ago. We have noted in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it but one slight misprint (which, however, occurs twice)—Adanctus for Adauctus.

The Story of New Mexico. By Horatio O. Ladd. [The Story of the States.] Boston: D. Lothrop Co.

"STORY" is a modest title for a book which, in fact, is the most accurate "history" of that Territory that has ever been published. Mr. Bancroft's more elaborate work has the merit of being infinitely superior to everything that preceded its appearance in the literary field, but Mr. Ladd's book has the advantage of being based upon information of a documentary character more detailed and more special even than that at Mr. Bancroft's command, touching the obscure periods in New Mexico's history that intervened between 1608 and 1680. The author enjoys, furthermore, the advantage of having resided in the country which he describes, of having travelled in it and viewed with intelligent eyes its scenery, its ruins, and its people. Hence the book has a certain merit of subjective actuality, well felt and fairly expounded, in such a plain and unassuming manner as to put the contents within easy reach even of youthful readers. The older periods of New Mexican history are, of course, briefly told, for they could not be treated at length without going into elaborate studies about Spanish law, ecclesiastical law, the relations between Church and State in the American colonies of Spain, and Spanish "Indian policy"—topics far too intricate and too extensive not to injure the popularity of the work. Still, Mr. Ladd has so far grasped the true point of view from which Spanish American history is to be considered as to be very fair and just, and to avoid the reefs upon which the ships of historical novelists have invariably stranded.

As regards the modern history of New Mexico, it is too early yet to write it without running the gauntlet of criticism of eye-witnesses. These eye-witnesses may all be sincere, but they see only one side of the events in which they have participated. Moreover, there is, at the bottom of everything that happens, an occult substratum which remains (and mostly has to remain) hidden for a long time from the public eye or even from the most careful investigator. Contemporaneous history is therefore always a very ungrateful task, but Mr. Ladd could not avoid it, and if, after doing the best he could, his work should incur censure, the fault lies not so much with him as with the task itself. Mr. Ladd has made several geographical mistakes that are inexcusable on the part of one who has so long resided in New Mexico and who has quite extensively travelled through that Territory. Thus, he identifies, and repeatedly too, Taos with Santa Cruz de la Cañada, and Albuquerque with Alameda. Taos lies forty miles north of Santa Cruz, and Albuquerque thirteen miles south of Alameda. Equally unpardonable is the frequent misspelling of Spanish words, so that it seems as if there had been no proof-reading at all, and this imparts to the whole an appearance of carelessness, of slovenliness even, that detracts greatly from the merits of an otherwise very commendable book. The illustrations, too, are not of a very high order, and not as well-selected as they might easily have been. In both respects a revised edition is plainly called for.

On the whole, Mr. Ladd's book is a gratifying step in the direction of fairness in history and independent judgment, unaffected by the stereotyped clamor against Spain in the New World.

A Treatise on the Geometry of the Circle, and some Extensions to Conic Sections by the method of Reciprocation. With numerous examples. By William J. McClelland, M.A. Macmillan. 1891.

OF the smaller and outlying branches of mathematics which have received attention of late years, none is more interesting than that of the remarkable lines, points, and circles of a triangle, which really forms the principal subject of this little treatise; and it is a subject in which any person skilled in elementary geometry and trigonometry can take pleasure. Mathematicians will welcome a convenient compendium of the theorems connected with Brocard's, Taylor's, and a dozen other circles, as to which they are now all expected to be *au fait*.

The methods of the book are rather promiscuous, the nomenclature is not always good (as when the well-known theorem of Matthew Stewart is called "Euler's theorem," a designation applied already to half-a-dozen different propositions), the enunciations are sometimes not clear, and the writer throughout has consulted his own comfort rather than the reader's. But, notwithstanding such relatively unimportant faults, the book is acceptable.

Handbooks of Athletic Sports. [Bohn's Library of Sports and Games.] Vols. V. and VI. London: George Bell & Sons. 1891.

THESE volumes deal with track athletics, cycling, skating, and riding, and are quite up to the high standard of vols. i. and ii., already noticed in these columns. It will be a surprise to those who have not followed the history of track athletics to learn how recent is the development of this branch of sport. It was not till 1864 that the first Oxford and Cambridge sports caused a sudden awakening of interest in England, and the response on this side of the Atlantic did not follow till the early seventies. Since that time there has been a more or less steady improvement in all kinds of performances, and hardly a season passes without the breaking of some records; but it is now believed that in running and jumping the limit of human capacity has been very nearly reached. On several occasions sprinters have covered 100 yards in less than ten seconds, while a jumper has cleared 6 feet 4¾ inches in height and some 23 feet in width—figures which would have seemed impossible to a winner at the Isthmian games.

Although a species of velocipede was invented in France as early as 1816, the modern bicycle with cranks may be said to date from 1866, in which year patents were granted both in this country and in England. Every year since has witnessed some improvement in the machines and a consequent increase of speed at all distances, and it seems certain that a man riding a bicycle will soon be able to cover a mile in less time than a trotting horse before a wagon. Besides all that is needful for the male cyclist, this volume contains an interesting chapter on cycling for ladies, which is well worth their consideration. As a means of exercise, cycling is distinctly superior to lawn tennis for the wearers of skirts, and it enables them to cover very considerable distances, and so enjoy new scenery with very slight fatigue.

Equally good is the chapter on ladies' skating, another exercise which they may safely indulge in when opportunity offers, and which, if properly taught, will tend to increase of both vigor and grace. The chapters on figure-skating cover all the well-known varieties, but that on speed-skating should have been brought down at least to the date of Donoghue's victories a year ago, which gave the championship of the world to this country.

Mr. Kerr's advice to those about to ride is quite the reverse of *Punch's* advice to those about to marry, but it is nevertheless sound and useful. He shows an intimate knowledge of all that pertains to horse-flesh, and strongly advocates the modern methods of treating young horses in many ways like young children. Every one who has had to do with horses knows the importance of meeting their obstinacy with firmness and patience, but few come up to the Yorkshire trainer who sat unmoved on an obstinate colt all day, had his meals brought out to him, and finally conquered the animal as he was adjusting his night-cap and otherwise preparing for a night session. A horse that has once been forced to yield in this way will never give any more trouble, whereas severe punishment ruins the horse's temper and generally fails to produce the desired result. Young riders will find Mr. Kerr's treatise full of valuable hints, and the only fault we have to find with it is the multitudinous recommendations of saddles and such things, with names and addresses of makers, which are too suggestive of the "reading notice."

The New York Obelisk. With a preliminary sketch of the history, erection, uses, and signification of obelisks. By Charles E. Moldenke. New York: Randolph. 1891. Pp. viii., 202.

A BOOK on an Egyptological subject printed in this country is not without precedent, but one containing hieroglyphic type set in America is a novelty. We have many monuments, inscriptions, and writings here which had Egypt as the land of their origin, and the greatest of them is the New York obelisk. It is a matter of interest to many to know what this great stone stands for and what it says. The author's intent has been to furnish an answer, and to some degree he has succeeded. He has presented a considerable array of facts, more or less pertinent, and he has given a series of translations of the texts.

But it is impossible to say that his book is satisfactory. The style is occasionally infelicitous or worse; the "preliminary sketch" is not sufficiently elaborated; even the facts which are presented are not fortified by the citation of authorities; there are a few mistakes in the transliterations, and there are some strange contrasts between the interlinear and the freer renderings. In the matter of explanations the author has been a little more successful, though the ordinary reader will be stumbled to find that he makes conflicting statements, and in one case at least explains the same thing in two inconsistent ways.

While full recognition must be given to the fact that the style of the writing found on such objects as obelisks is extremely abbreviated, and that it presents more problems to the student than almost any other, still one who essays to give a true rendering must know that grammatical forms underlay the writing and must now determine the meaning. The renderings here given are approximately correct, but he would be rash indeed who should claim that any text has yet been translated absolutely without error. The specimens which this book affords are of the stereotyped sort with which we have been so long familiar. The author has not advanced beyond what has long been published, and he has not added any new explanations of value. In fact, he seems not to have known that anything has been done to-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wards a more exact determination of grammatical forms or of the structure of sentences.

Upon the whole, the book is behind the times. It might have passed muster ten years ago, but it will not answer now. In general it will give the reader some idea of the subject, but he who should rely upon its every statement, and attempt to draw thence conclusions as to details, will be apt to find them seriously questioned. Numerous minor errors might be pointed out which vitiate its results except in a large and general way. Since that which is wanted is as exact information as the present state of investigation will allow, the author must be adjudged to have failed to satisfy reasonable demands.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bercy, Paul. Le Français Pratique. W. R. Jenkins. $1.
Bierbower, Austin. The Morals of Christ. 2d ed. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & Co. 50 cents.
Colbert, Prof. E. Humanity in its Origin and Early Growth. Chicago: *Open Court* Pub. Co. $1.50.
Crosby, Edith R. "Blessed are they that Mourn." James Pott & Co. 50 cents.
Dilke, Sir C. W., and Wilkinson, S. Imperial Defence. Macmillan. $1.25.
Evans, E. W. Walter Savage Landor: A Critical Study. Putnams. $1.25.
Goodwin, Prof. W. W., and White, Prof. J. W. The First Four Books of Xenophon's Anabasis. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.65.
In Tent and Bungalow. Cassell. 50 cents.
Johnson, Samuel. Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia. [Knickerbocker Nuggets.] Putnams. $1.
Krause, Gustav. The Growth of German Unity. London: David Nutt.
Lawless, Emily. Grania: The Story of an Island. Macmillan. $1.
Lecomte, Maurice. Bouderie. Scenette en un Acte. W. R. Jenkins. 25 cents.
Le Gallienne, Richard. The Book-Bills of Narcissus. Scribners. $2.
Logan, Celia. How to Reduce Your Weight or Increase it. W. A. Kellogg. 50 cents.
Longmans' New School Atlas. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.50.
Longmans' New Atlas. Longmans, Green & Co. $3.
Lorne, The Marquis of. Viscount Palmerston. [The Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria.] Harpers.
Marshall, Frederick. It Happened Yesterday. Appletons.
Matthews, Brander. In the Vestibule Limited. Harpers.
Maurice, Rev. F. D. Sermons Preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel. Vol. IV. Macmillan. $1.25.
Maxcy, C. L. Shakspere's Hamlet. Boston: Ginn & Co. 50 cents.
McCaskey, J. P. The Franklin Square Song Collection. No. 8. 50 cents.
Meredith, George. Modern Love. Portland, Me.: Thomas B. Mosher.
Miller, Rev. Emory. The Evolution of Love. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.50.
Moore, George. Vain Fortune. Scribners. $1.
Mr. Leslie and Mrs. Lennox. Cassell. 50 cents.
Muirhead, J. H. The Elements of Ethics. [University Extension Manuals.] Scribners. $1.
Muller-Simonis, P. Du Caucase au Golfe Persique, à travers l'Arménie, le Kurdistan et la Mésopotamie. Washington: Université Catholique d'Amérique; New York: Westermann.
Murray, A. S. Handbook of Greek Archæology. London: John Murray; New York: Scribners. $6.
Ohnet, Georges. Le Chant du Cygne. W. R. Jenkins. 25 cents.
Orr, Mrs. Sutherland. A Handbook to the Works of Robert Browning. 6th ed. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.75.
Pelletreau, Charles. Sylvester Romaine. James Pott & Co.
Perrot, Georges, and Chipiez, Charles. History of Art in Phrygia, Lydia, Caria and Lycia. London: Chapman & Hall; New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.
Perrot, Georges, and Chipiez, Charles. History of Art in Persia. London: Chapman & Hall; New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.
Pinkerton, T. A. A New Saint's Tragedy. Harpers. 50 cents.
Pollard, A. W. Herrick's Works. 2 vols. London: Lawrence & Bullen; New York: Scribners. $3.50.
Pool, Maria L. Roweny in Boston. Harpers.
Praeger, Ferdinand. Wagner as I Knew Him. Longmans.
Prince, J. T. Methods of Instruction and Organization in the German Schools. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.
Protestant Episcopal Layman's Handbook. 2d ed. Baker & Taylor Co. $1.25.
Recollections of a Happy Life: Being the Autobiography of Marianne North. 2 vols. Macmillan. $7.
Remondino, P. C. The Mediterranean Shores of America. Southern California, its Climatology, etc. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis. $1.25.
Richards, George. The Law of Insurance. Banks & Bros. $5.
Roberts, D. L. Browne's Religio Medici, and Other Essays. London: David Stott; New York: Macmillan. 75 cents.
Rogers, Prof. J. E. T. The Industrial and Commercial History of England. Putnams. $3.
Rolfe, W. J. Scott's Lady of the Lake. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
Rollins, Alice W. From Palm to Glacier. Putnams. $1.75.
Royce, Prof. J. The Spirit of Modern Philosophy. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.50.
Ruskin, John. The Crown of Wild Olive. [Brantwood Edition.] Charles E. Merrill & Co. $1.50.
Russell, S. A. Electric Light Cables and the Distribution of Electricity. London: Whittaker & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $2.25.
Saintsbury, G. Selections from Defoe's Minor Novels. London: Percival & Co.
Sargent, Epes. Peculiar; A Hero of the Southern Rebellion. New ed. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 50 cents.
Savage-Armstrong, G. F. One in the Infinite. Longmans, Green & Co. $2.50.
Schelling, Prof. F. E. Ben Jonson's Timber. Boston: Ginn & Co. 90 cents.
Schloss, D. F. Methods of Industrial Remuneration. Putnams. $1.50.
Schwabe, Ludwig. Teufel's History of Roman Literature. Vol. 2. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $4.
Sellar, Prof. W. Y. The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. Horace and the Elegiac Poets. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $3.50.
Shepp's Photographs of the World. Frank Hegger.
Shiells, Robert. The Story of the Token. John Ireland. $1.
Shorter, C. K. Lyrics and Sonnets of Wordsworth. London: David Stott; New York: Macmillan. 75 cents.
Simmel, Georg. Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft: Eine Kritik der ethischen Grundbegriffe. Erster Band. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
Smith, Emily J. Selections from Lucian. Harpers.
Smith, Goldwin. The Moral Crusader, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biographical Essay. Funk & Wagnalls Co. $1.

A SCHOOL-BOOK.

Laboratory Exercises in Elementary Physics.

By CHAS. R. ALLEN, S.B., Instructor in the New Bedford (Mass.) High School. *Pupil's Edition.* x+209 pp. 12mo. Teachers' price, 80 cents; by mail, 89 cents. *Teacher's Edition.* x+277 pp. 12mo. Teachers' price, $1.00; by mail, $1.10. Most of these exercises exact of the pupil measurements of some sort. They are carefully adjusted to the usual text-book study and lecture-table demonstrations. They are planned for young beginners, employ no elaborate and unduly expensive apparatus, require no more than forty-five minutes each in the laboratory, and are so framed that the pupil can prepare himself beforehand to make the most of his time there with the least help from his instructor. The teacher's edition contains much suggestive matter upon the simplification and home construction of apparatus, time-saving devices, etc.

Henry Holt & Co., Publishers,
NEW YORK.

AUTHORS AND PUBLISHERS—Material collected and compiled for all kinds of works, excepting fiction. Statistics a specialty. Indexing and cataloguing. Address G. E. BIVER, 835 N. 16th St., Philadelphia.

Contributions Solicited
FOR A
FIRST-CLASS JOURNAL
devoted exclusively to
Music, Art, and Literature.
For particulars, address JOSEPH GOULD, P. O. Box 667, Montreal, Canada.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

Wanted—Work in Translating from German into English

Or from English into German, by German lady who studied at Oxford (England) and who has lived for over seven years in England and in America as a teacher of languages. Continuous literary or philosophical work preferred. Address "GERMAN TRANSLATOR," care the *Nation*, or care Prof. H. A. Rowland, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

"The weary brain requires some nerve sustaining element as food."—HERBERT SPENCER.

Crosby's Vitalized Phosphites.

The vital principle of animal and vegetable life isolated from the ox brain and wheat germ.

The loss of memory, the tired and exhausted feeling, the dull, unrefreshed sleep, or nervous sleeplessness, brain weariness, depressed vitality, are simply the brain and nervous system calling for their necessary food. In this condition the Vitalized Phosphites give great relief. It restores the true protagon, the brain phosphoid, increases brain and nerve power by specially feeding the nerve centres. It reinvigorates brain and body.

For thirty years endorsed by leading physcians, and the world's best brain workers. Formula on the label. Piamphlet free to those who write for it. Druggists or by mail, $1.00. 56 W. 25th St., N. Y. *F. Crosby Co.*

Exhaustion.

HORSFORD'S ACID PHOSPHATE.

A wonderful remedy, of the highest value in mental and nervous exhaustion.

Overworked men and women, the nervous, weak, and debilitated, will find in the Acid Phosphate a most agreeable, grateful, and harmless stimulant, giving renewed strength and vigor to the entire system.

Dr. Edwin F. Vose, Portland, Me., says: "I have used it in my own case when suffering from nervous exhaustion, with gratifying results. I have prescribed it for many of the various forms of nervous debility, and it has never failed to do good."

Descriptive pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

CAUTION: Be sure the word "Horsford's" is on the label. All others are spurious. Never sold in bulk.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED